

**MEETING OF THE U.S. NATIONAL COMMISSION ON LIBRARIES
AND INFORMATION SCIENCE**

- -

**THE DIGITAL DIVIDE AND
THE ROLE OF THE COMMISSION**

- -

Suite 820 Vermont Avenue, N.W. Washington, D.C.

Monday, April 10, 2000

The meeting was convened at 1:05 p.m., MARTHA B. GOULD, Chairperson, presiding.

COMMISSIONERS:

MARTHA B. GOULD, Chairperson
JOAN R. CHALLINOR, Vice Chair
C.E. "ABE" ABRAMSON
REBECCA T. BINGHAM
MARY S. FURLONG
JOSÉ-MARIE GRIFFITHS
JACK E. HIGHTOWER
ELIZABETH SYWETZ

STAFF:

ROBERT S. WILLARD, Executive Director
JUDITH C. RUSSELL, Deputy Director
ELIZABETH E. BINGHAM, Consultant
DENISE DAVIS
FOREST WOODY HORTON, Consultant
ROSALIE VLACH
BARBARA WHITELEATHER

GUESTS:

ANDY CARVIN, Benton Foundation
PAYTON NEAL, Software and Information Industry Association
JOEY RODGER, President, Urban Libraries Council
EMILY SHEKETOFF, American Library Association
NANCY WEISS, General Counsel, Institute of Museum and Library Services
ANN MOLOD

PROCEEDINGS

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: I welcome everybody. Emily, you have a place at the table. I think everybody can hear me okay. I think the first thing I would like to do is just have everyone go around and introduce themselves to each other. This is a very informal afternoon. It is an afternoon of sharing ideas and brainstorming.

My name is Martha Gould. I'm a retired librarian and currently the Chairperson of the Commission.

MR. CARVIN: Hi. My name is Andy Carvin. I'm with the Benton Foundation here in Washington. I'm joining you for this informal brainstorm discussion on the digital divide. At the Benton Foundation I run a project called the Digital Divide Network, which I'll tell you about in greater detail later.

Glad to be here. Thanks.

COMMISSIONER HIGHTOWER: Hi. My name is Jack Hightower. I'm a retired Texan.

(Laughter.)

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: They don't let you retire from Texas.

COMMISSIONER HIGHTOWER: No, I'm just tired, that's all.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Not retired, but tired.

MS. SHEKETOFF: I'll just have to speak really loudly.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Take the wireless one.

MS. SHEKETOFF: I'm Emily Sheketoff with the American Library Association. Libraries are very concerned with the digital divide and so we're happy to be here.

MS. SYWETZ: I'm Betsy Sywetz, the Institute of Museum and Library Services.

MS. VLACH: Rosalie Vlach, staff.

MR. HORTON: Woody Horton, consultant.

MS. DAVIS: Denise Davis, staff.

MS. BINGHAM: Beth Bingham, consultant.

MR. NEAL: Payton Neal on behalf of the Software and Information Industry Association.

COMMISSIONER GRIFFITHS: José-Marie Griffiths, Commissioner.

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: Abe Abramson, Commissioner.

COMMISSIONER BINGHAM: Commissioner Bingham.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: It's not worth turning on. I have four children. I can get my voice down to that end of the room.

Joan Challinor, assistant to Martha Gould.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: She's more than an assistant to Martha Gould. She is the Vice Chairman of the Commission.

Thank you all for coming here this afternoon. When the Commission submitted their appropriation information and justification to Congress, we highlighted some policy areas that we believed we could be expected to address, given the adequate funding. One area of course is the area of the digital divide.

I wanted to read you something that we put in the letter that went to the chairman and the ranking member of our Appropriations Subcommittee: "This term 'the digital divide' has sprung into headlines and reports throughout the nation over just the past year or two. It is the shorthand

term to describe the phenomenon that there is a greater penetration of personal computers into homes of people with above-average incomes than those less well off.

"The Commission is supportive of the research that has identified this development, but feels the digital divide is more accurately defined as the difference between those who know how to use networked computers to improve their lives and those who do not. To put it into a term that first showed up in a Commission report in the early seventies, we need to put energy into measuring and improving information literacy, the skill of using information.

"Public and school libraries and schools have major roles to play in addressing information literacy, and the Commission has a unique ability to support and highlight the role that libraries play in addressing the digital divide, especially the role of school libraries, and it is important that the Commission have sufficient funding to address this issues."

Now, this meeting this afternoon is an opportunity for everyone here to brainstorm on just what the Commission can do to become more involved in the issue or decide that enough other parties are addressing it that we need not use any of our very scarce resources on this particular issue.

Technically, this discussion will be a part of our meeting. We will not recognize the presence or the absence of a quorum, so that we can just discuss. And we will not take any votes. That we will do tomorrow.

Indeed, in our discussion tomorrow of the Commission's strategic plan I believe there will be an opportunity too address the digital divide and to determine where, if at all, it fits into the overall plans of the Commission. Then we will have a transcript of the proceedings for further reference.

Now, one of the rules in brainstorming is there is no such thing as a bad idea, and I think we need to embrace this concept. That means no dismissing out of hand anybody's ideas, but for now let's start just with getting as many ideas as possible onto the table.

As a last comment, Mr. Willard will be joining us late. He is fulfilling a speaking commitment for Jeanne Simon at the American Association of Community Colleges and as soon as that commitment is fulfilled he will be back here to join us.

So with that, I will open up the discussion, and who would like to go first?

MS. RUSSELL: I think it would be good to have some background from Andy. It might help us.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Great. Andy, you're on.

MR. CARVIN: Thanks. Let me try to use this because I tend to talk with my hands a lot. Thank you.

Now, as I mentioned a little earlier, I'm with the project called the Digital Divide Network. Now, the Digital Divide Network has only been around for a few months. Its history goes back approximately six to eight months ago when the Benton Foundation teamed up with the National Urban League and the AOL Foundation to create a project called Helping.org.

Helping.org is an online philanthropy portal that invites citizens to find new ways to volunteer in their communities, to give to nonprofits all over the country, to learn more about how to bring in technical assistance for local nonprofits and what's going on in the digital divide.

So with these four sections, the digital divide clearinghouse became the single area where people could go and find out all the latest news and research and reports on the digital divide, but that's all it really was. It was a clearinghouse, it was a one-way stream of information without any interaction or goal-setting.

Now, with the Digital Divide Summit that happened this past November-December here in D.C. at the Department of Commerce there was suddenly this opportunity where a whole slew of major corporations and foundations were getting together and saying, we agree that there is a digital divide and we agree that there's something we can do about it.

So practically overnight the digital divide clearinghouse from Helping.org was transformed into its own separate project, the Digital Divide Network. The web site for that is www.digitaldividenetwork.org. The Digital Divide Network went online in mid-December of '99 and essentially what we have here is a central hub for practitioners involved in digital divide issues, mainly at the local level.

What we're trying to really do here is take the information that was available to the digital divide clearinghouse and then make it interactive. So for example, if AOL or Microsoft announce that they have a new digital divide initiative and it has features A, B, and C, not only are they able to put that information out there; what we want to do is create a community where people at the local level who are working on digital divide issues can then respond and say: Yes, we think this project will work well because it's addressing these issues, but I don't think it's scalable because you're not doing this.

So in other words, we want this large group of companies and foundations to put their initiatives on the table and be opened up to constructive criticism.

The network currently has about major partners and these range from corporations like IBM, Microsoft, AOL, Intel, Bell Atlantic, just the name a few, as well as nonprofits such as the Benton Foundation, National Urban League, Markell Foundation, Ford Foundation, and I believe the MacArthur Foundation is a member as well now. They're coming on every week practically, so it's very easy to lose track of who's joining in and who's not.

So with the resources we're all pulling together, we're in the process of developing this online resource that targets digital divide practitioners. By practitioners, I mean librarians, supervisors of local volunteer projects, the directors of community technology centers, teachers, graduate

students working on digital divide research -- all those local constituents who have agreed that it's worth studying or working on the digital divide, but not the general populace directly.

The reason for that, it's kind of a paradox to target individual citizens using the Internet when what you're talking about is that there's a lack of access and proper use of the Internet. So because we recognize that paradox, we're really trying to work with those intermediary groups and those intermediary individuals who do have access already.

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: Is it all right for us to ask questions as you go along?

MR. CARVIN: Absolutely. Interrupt me.

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: Well, I don't want to interrupt you.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Just remember to identify yourself.

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: I'm just curious what the interface is or has become with the Department of Commerce's rolling out, I guess you could say, that they had in January of their digital divide conference. Has that impacted in a positive way on your program?

MR. CARVIN: I think so, yes, because the summit itself is what really inspired, inspired the clearinghouse to become a network. We had the situation where everyone knew the heads of all these major foundations and companies were going to be in D.C. and for the first time ever AOL and Microsoft were will to sit down and look each other in the face without killing each other. This was one issue they could come together on.

So the network was created as a way of them to commit to that agreement that they would put down their swords on this particular issue and find ways to work together. So it directly spawned the network in many ways.

Now that the Clinton Administration is in the process of developing its own digital divide strategy, which we can certainly talk about later, we're trying to use the network as a place where new parts of the initiative can be announced and tried out, because so far a lot of them are really ideas. Nothing has been put into place because, again, Congress has to pass it and they have to pass the new budget, and that certainly hasn't been signed into law yet.

Until that happens we're in a position where discussion and interaction can going on and analyze the way the Clinton initiative might work and whether or not it makes sense or if other things should be tried. For example, the Clinton proposal doesn't specifically address the issue of the e-rate and how to leverage e-rate resources that have been developed over the last couple years and connecting it with new projects.

So it acknowledges that the e-rate is out there and it's done a lot of good things, but there's not a direct correlation between how these new projects might relate to e-rate activities at the local level.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Andy, you, the Benton Foundation, did a report on the four cities that does address that very issue.

MR. CARVIN: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: And it's full of some really fascinating information.

MR. CARVIN: Yes, about I'd say six weeks ago we put out a new report called "The E- rate in America" -- that's not it.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: No, that's the wrong one.

MR. CARVIN: It's a big purple document.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: It's the purple document.

MR. CARVIN: It's called "The E-rate in America: A Tale of Four Cities." It's available on our web site, so if you go to www.benton.org right on the left-hand side you'll see a link to where you can download it for free.

What we did in this study is we worked with the Center for Children and Technology at the Education Development Center in New York and had them specifically take a look at how the e-rate was being implemented in four large urban school districts in the Midwest: Chicago, Cleveland, Detroit, and Milwaukee.

Each of these districts has a whole slew of local political and educational problems that have been plaguing it for years while at the same time they got some of the largest e-rate awards that were out there. I believe they got the second, third, fourth, and seventh or eighth largest awards, so they were all in the top ten, in the tens of millions of dollars each.

So what we did is we took a look specifically at what happened when that money became available to these districts, different aspects of the administration such as the instructional technology services group and the curriculum development group, were they able to work together well, did the school superintendent and school board buy into the e-rate or were they skeptical about it.

Those were the sort of things we looked at. Just to be quick on some of the findings that we have, first of all, more often than not administrators at the highest levels were not buying into the e-rate. Before the money became available they didn't believe it was out there and once the money became available they doubted it would last.

So even though in some districts, like in Milwaukee, the district superintendent has certainly done a very good job at creating a leadership role from how technology is going to be used in the classroom, the vast majority of the grunt work evolving around the e-rate has taken place at the middle level.

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: That is in Milwaukee?

MR. CARVIN: Not as badly in Milwaukee, but certainly in the others. But there was definitely a general trend where all the applications, all the planning, all the policy-setting, was really done by the technology coordinators. And because these particular districts had very strong tech coordinators what were given leeway by the superintendents, things worked out well.

But it does raise the issue of what happens in a smaller district or a poorer district that doesn't have a full-time coordinator or has a technology coordinator that doesn't have experience in grants management or grant applications or these other things. If they lack those resources, what does that suggest? Will there be leadership somewhere within that system that will actually allow them to implement the e-rate successfully?

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: One of the things that concerns me, and you've just hit on it when you talked about the superintendent and top administration not buying into something: How do we make the leap from just the connectivity to really involving not only state superintendents, but district superintendents, and taking it down too principals? Because site administration is a very strong movement right now nationally in terms of how school districts operate.

How do we get them involved into the whole planning? Because you just can't connect - - there is content to be considered, there is curriculum to be considered. There are the ongoing costs to be considered, which are considerably more than just the cost of connectivity.

MR. CARVIN: Well, that's really the \$64,000, question. In many ways, if you look back at how the e-rate has worked over the last couple of years, it really is a microcosm of the digital divide issue. If you think back to '96 -'97 when the e-rate was first really being proposed and was gaining strength, it was almost seen in a naive way that simply bringing Internet access too the schools was going to make an instant difference, that let's just get the infrastructure out there, let's bring in the networking and the services and we'll worry about the other stuff later.

In many ways you're seeing that with the digital divide now: Let's wire every house in America, let's put a community technology center in every community. All well and good activities and I support them, but in both cases, with the e-rate and what's going on and with the digital divide, if those activities are not directly correlated with literacy programs, with content issues, both in terms of content being available for the citizen and the ability for citizens and communities to create their own robust content, and also the whole issue of getting community buy-in, because if a school district or a community or the leaders of those communities don't buy into the technology it doesn't matter if it's available because they're not going to want to invest in it.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Rebecca and then José.

COMMISSIONER BINGHAM: My background is schools and school libraries, and I'm very interested in our getting those people in the smaller districts that do not have the technology leaders. Is there any possibility of our addressing the principals organization, the national principals group, asking to appear on their program, the superintendents, the supervision and curriculum directors, the groups, and begin that way? Because until they are convinced, they are

really not going to buy into it. But the organization and structure is there, even the superintendents association.

MR. CARVIN: Well, I think the simple answer to that is yes, that's one of the few ways really to go. It really needs to be at both the local level and the national level. At the local level you need to have technology leaders, be they parents or teachers, the technology coordinator, finding the politically appropriate way for them to get in the faces of their principals and their other administrative leaders and saying we have to have community buy-in on this, we have to set long-term goals instead of doing this piecemeal.

So at the local level you've got that dynamic. At the national level there needs to be -- there has to be more buy-in with the various principal organizations and the school board organizations as well. Clearly, at the NSBA every year they've got their technology and learning conference. They do recognize the importance of technology in the classroom and I certainly believe they're beginning to address digital divide as well.

The challenge is creating a proper dialogue that goes beyond simple dialogue, because I've lost track of the number of digital divide presentations and conferences I've been to in the last six months, and I can count the number of actual actions that have come out of them on one hand.

That's not to criticize any of the discussions that have happened because, if anything, they have opened many people's eyes to different things and it's also opened my eyes to different perspectives that I didn't have before. But unless some of these discussions, especially these high-powered discussions at the national level, unless they can be part of a process that leads to direct action, it may unfortunately just be talk.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: José.

COMMISSIONER GRIFFITHS: I have a couple of concerns. One is that in effect the whole notion of digital divide has been around for a long, long time, not necessarily at the level of granularity that we're talking about it now. But if you think about the role of technology for developing countries and the role of technology in the western world, we saw significant difference in people's ability to access, communicate with each other, access resources that were available.

So my concern, though, is what's always happened in those circumstances is that people, with all the best motivation in the world, have always assumed that the have-not's must go through the same developmental sequence as the have's, and therefore in a sense, as I always saw it, always keeping the have-not's one step behind the have's and keeping the have's one step ahead.

Just as there were opportunities in the early to mid seventies for developing countries to leapfrog in technology utilization which didn't quite happen because they tended to be given the old mainframes that nobody wanted, there's an opportunity now, it seems to me, for us to look at the world that we're moving into and really think first about the role that technology will play in it and how technology can really empower the individual.

I see so many reports that talk about how organizations and institutions can be connected. I don't see too many people really and truly thinking about the transformational nature of the technology. So I see it myself at the University of Michigan, where we still, I am dismayed to say, are still implementing technology the do what we've always done, instead of thinking about what we could do and what we ought to do and then figure out a way that technology can help us do that. So I have a real concern there.

One other comment is in a sense, in addition to going to the principals and teachers, I think another point where you can access those people is at the colleges and schools of education, where you capture people before they actually go out into the schools and give them some understanding of what the world is evolving into.

MR. CARVIN: I would absolutely second that, which is why I'm a strong supporter of the PTTT program, the PT program, which is a now maybe \$150 million grant program to develop cutting edge technology integration and technology professional development for pre- service teachers. If you're not willing to create comprehensive technology literacy for pre- service teachers, you're going to be wasting so many opportunities, because by the time you become a full in-service teacher you don't have the time, you don't have the energy. You've got so many other dilemmas and priorities you must focus on that, unless you happen to be one of these folks that really enjoys technology from technology's sake, it's difficult to get a large segment of the teaching population to buy into technology, especially if they feel they're doing a decent job as it is.

I mean, all teachers know that their teaching skills could improve, but they don't like being told that, across the board you're all doing poorly in technology, we'll suddenly revolutionize the way you interact with your students. It's really approaching it the wrong way.

They need to be able to go through a longer period of contemplation and appreciation of how technology may personally relate to their own teaching styles and interests, and really the pre-service stage is the most natural point the do that. And unfortunately, since it appears Congress is not exactly in support of the PT program to say the least, it's really hard to say where that's going to go.

Just to quickly address, though, the issue of developing countries, you're definitely right. The U.S. is a very strange animal, there's no denying that. Clearly we created the Internet, we created the whole dynamic of how the Internet works. We've also created this whole dynamic on how the Internet is now a ubiquitous tool for consumers, and I really want to put the emphasis on the word "consumers" -- not citizens or community members or advocates or producers, but consumers, people what are consuming other people's stuff.

So you've got all these great companies putting it out constantly on the Internet, but it's specifically because they want people the buy into things, they want people to see advertising, they want to do all these other things, and it's not necessarily for the greater good of certain communities or society as a whole, even though that kind of gets tucked in at certain points.

So in a way the die has already been cast here in America. There will always be civic networks and community networks, but on the whole the Internet will be a commercial entity here. The

question is does that make sense for every community and every nation in the world? I certainly don't think so, especially if you take a look at some of the developing nations in Africa, countries in Eastern Europe, Central Asia, Pacific Rim. They clearly are not in a position where they want to focus on having cheap access to Nikes or have cheap access to Priceline.com so they can buy better groceries.

Those are great services once your economy and your infrastructure are at a point where you can afford those things. But if you're still at a developing stage there's a whole other dynamic of how the Internet can be used, and also a different technical dynamic. It doesn't make sense to be putting wires across African savannah. Wireless makes sense. Wireless makes sense in the better part of Asia.

Yet those technologies are definitely behind. Even though they're very cutting edge here, they're very behind in terms of individual adoption. So they're very expensive, and so the things that are needed the most are the most expensive things there.

COMMISSIONER GRIFFITHS: Can I follow up on that?

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Yes.

COMMISSIONER GRIFFITHS: I didn't bring up the developing countries really to address them that specifically. My concern is if we follow the same pattern that we followed in the seventies in looking at technology and developing countries, we're saying, gosh, those that have -- and most of us around the table have, right -- have access to Internet technologies and everything that it makes available to us, from work, from home, from wherever, and there are segments of our communities who don't.

My concern is that we will then say, how can I help these people have and use what I have and use the way I have it and use it.

MR. CARVIN: Right.

COMMISSIONER GRIFFITHS: Rather than the way they need to have it.

MR. CARVIN: Right. I hate using the term "technological imperialism," but that's a concern, the same way that you have a form of consumer content imperialism like I was describing before, where you have the AOL model of Internet use suddenly become the de facto use for every nation on Earth. And that's not necessarily a healthy thing.

The communities that make up any given group need to decide for themselves, first of all, if it makes any sense for them to be worried about this technology yet. If you still don't have access to clean water or electricity, you've got to deal with those things, too, and certainly deal with them first.

But if a particular nation or community is at the point where they can start making these kinds of investments, they need to begin by addressing what are the needs of this community, what

services are lacking here, what opportunities are lacking, what educational opportunities are missing, and can this investment in technology help make up for that? Or is it something that you do at a slightly slower pace, so you continue making investments in more traditional things such as electrification, water purification, expanding literacy?

I have a feeling the answer is going to be closer to that and a little bit more conservative, where you have certain experiments, prototypes of technology use in parts of the country, but then at the same time very intensive focus on these other things. Like if you just take a look at what's going on in India right now, Clinton's trip to India really put a good light on what's going on there.

It's one of the most impoverished places on Earth, but yet if you go to places like Bangalore and Hyderabad there are multi-billion dollar companies and there are Bangalore millionaires the same way that there are Microsoft millionaires and AOL millionaires here. Certain Indian states, like Kerala, they're advancing their technology by first saying every young woman in the state will be literate by the time they're ten. That's their first goal. There's a very strong focus on literacy and individualism and entrepreneurialism in schools. And because that particular state has bought into this, it's been easier for them to start advancing on these other things.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Denise.

MS. DAVIS: I just wanted to comment piggybacking on José-Marie's points and yours as well. Rather than -- I would use the word "elitist," not "imperialist." And having worked in higher education and having had the luxury of access to the Internet as a telecommunication device for decades, and recognizing that for a very long time the communication was between researchers all over the western world, not the eastern world, nothing has changed. Absolutely nothing has changed.

We still live in a country where people don't have telephone service. So when we talk about not having things, we're really talking about what many of us would presume as basic utilities.

One thing I find interesting, though, is the leapfrogging of the growth of the Internet as a consumer device because those individuals saw it as a way to communicate more broadly than the printed page and to really drive that internationally. The sad thing -- and this isn't to defend the teacher necessarily, but their hands are tied.

I mean, a teacher can sit in a classroom and beg for technology and not be given it, know full well that they could have this access, and they're prevented from having it because of the governance structure in their community in the state they live in. I'm not sure how we change that, even in the states.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Abe.

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: I think I first started to appreciate this issue at IFLA in Copenhagen, where our chair was especially also struck by it and pretty vocal about it, because

the country of Denmark had sponsored specifically a number of people from countries where they didn't have telephone service.

I guess it's shocking. You made the point that there are places in the United States that don't have telephone service today.

MS. DAVIS: Across town.

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: Yes. But we do have percent of the households hooked up in this country. But the last figure I saw was that there are a billion and a half people in the world what have never touched a telephone.

MS. DAVIS: It's not that high. We actually have a situation now where we have more people with cell phones, portable phones, than we have with hard-wired phones.

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: But percent of households in the United States, according to USWest --

MR. CARVIN: Actually that is still, that's the Department of Commerce statistic, is around percent.

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: I sit on an advisory board or USWest and that's the number they use: 95 percent of households have dial tone access to the network, households in the United States. That could include cell phones.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: Does that count the Indian reservations?

MR. CARVIN: Well, the majority of that 5 percent is coming from Native Americans.

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: Yes, that's where most of it comes from. We have seven Indian reservations in Montana, and that's where most of that comes from.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: I would also like to point out that, even though "95 percent of the households" may be wired, what level of telecommunication do they have? If you look at my state, Nevada, where we have telephone companies, major ones, Contel and Nevada Bell, and the rest, you know, the little ma and pa, they have no ability to really hook in because they can't afford to buy the technology that will allow them.

So just too say that people have telephone service is simply not adequate.

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: No. And on top of that, from a lot of just Indian reservations it's long distance. There is a long distance charge to call the school where your child attends or any other business in your area. But beyond that, assume that we have something like percent connectivity, the last figure I saw is there are a billion and a half people in the world who have never touched, touched, either a telephone or a toothbrush.

MR. CARVIN: The statistic that's usually quoted is 50 percent of the world adult population has never made a phone call or turned on a light switch. I don't know specifically where these statistics come from, but it's cited.

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: But I think this underscores my colleague's point that we really don't want the old wheel, much less reinvent the wheel, that we shouldn't even think about it in terms of generation-skipping technology. When we're talking about areas that have no service, we should put them on the edge of the curve and save money overall.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Joan.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: My eyes were opened at the conference in Amsterdam and also the follow-up conference to IFLA was the Women's Library Conference. The women came in there and they said that the technology is essentially boys' toys and that men are terribly interested in technology, but they're not interested in technology to do things; they're interested in technology for its own sake.

What they were pleading for was the United States, looking straight at the group from the United States: Stop playing with the upper echelon technology and begin to think about things like solar radios. If a woman has a dying baby in the back of the bush in Africa, technology will be of little use unless she can get to it or it can get to her.

What they were asking is that we think of technology on all levels and they said we don't. And they are very specific because, being women in the developing world, they're never going to get jobs anyway, so they don't care what they say. They said: We're never going to think of it like that because this is so much more fun than thinking about solar radios. Nobody thinks solar radios are fun.

MR. CARVIN: Well, there is some progress in those areas. It's just not very well publicized, because right now for \$70 you can go to a Radio Shack and buy a wind-up radio.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: We can. What they're asking is to get those from Radio Shack.

MR. CARVIN: Well, the company, the South African company -- I think they're in South Africa -- that developed the device originally, they're working on trying to find a way to make it cheaper and cheaper, because they do know the price point isn't low enough.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: There is no price point that is low enough. But we will fund higher technology, they say, which goes to the big cities so that the businessmen can look at the data. But what they feel, and I'm telling you what they say, is that we really don't care about those babies, because there is technology to save dying babies, but we won't see that it gets to the people who are actually taking care of the babies or, alternatively, there is information about farming and that we don't realize or we don't take into consideration that farming in the developing world is done by women, it is not done by men. But there's no way for them to get the information that they need in order to farm properly because we want to send it all to the big

cities. We zero in on the capital city, who is delighted to get this stuff, and they were very, very specific.

But I want to congratulate you on saying that what we have here is commercial technology because my question is, this divide between the have's and the have-not's has existed for an awfully long time. How come suddenly this is a big issue: Hey, wake up everybody; we've got a divide.

MR. CARVIN: That's a delicate question, to say the least, because we at Benton have been catching a lot of flack lately just because a lot of people have made the argument that the reason why AOL and Microsoft and these other companies are saying there's a digital divide is because it's in their best business interest.

I don't think there's any denying that, but that doesn't change the fact that over the last ten years there have been hundreds of community technology centers and civic networks, community networks, public broadcasters, library associations, all these different groups who have recognized that technology in many communities has led to tremendous benefit.

So how can they model be adapted and used in appropriate ways in other communities? So by the time that the e-rate came around and appeared to be fairly successful and got a lot of public buy-in, I think the administration was able to look back and see that the public accepted the e-rate and the e-rate seems to be doing a lot of good.

The original idea behind the e-rate was to go much broader and to offer Internet access to nonprofits and all these other groups. Why don't we try to pick off where we left off and see if we can make something more out of it, and oh, by the way, it's called the digital divide now, so let's call it that.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: The word "digital divide" has caught everybody's attention.

MR. CARVIN: Sure.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: That's right. Well, I think it's more sexy than the information have's and have-not's.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: Well, how about poverty?

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: People don't like to talk about poverty.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: That's exactly right.

MR. CARVIN: I think the thing is people like to talk about the digital divide because it's about whether or not people have access the cutting edge technology. They don't want to admit that the digital divide is really about civil rights and poverty. That's really what it boils down to.

When I've made that argument to certain groups that have been cynical about the digital divide they'll say, well then, you're just trying to take past problems and repackage them in a new way. And I suppose my answer to that is yes, if that's really the case, then fine.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: If that's what it takes.

MR. CARVIN: If this is what it takes to get people's attention, to recognize the gulf that exists between have's and have-not's in society, if technology can be a way of offering new skills and services, then so be it.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Joan, why don't we share this microphone between the two of us.

MS. DAVIS: I'm handing out an article that I actually found a link to from the Benton Foundation. They push a message every day and this was in the list. It's "Pick up a phone, Tell-me will surf the web for you." It's a piece of software that does voice recognition and will then do a search.

What I find interesting in this news piece is it opens with the statement: "The latest Internet surfing device has been around for years, the telephone." But as you read this article it doesn't say anything about people finding health care information. It talks about people being able to get theater tickets and baseball game schedules and eventually do E-Trade over the phone.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: E-Trade?

MS. DAVIS: Well, yes. It goes on to talk about stocks and things like that.

So here we are. But this is the environment we're living in right now, which is low edge, and pushing, trying to saturate a market with this information, which is fine. But eventually it really does need the roll into things that are more substantive than advertising.

MR. CARVIN: Well, in order for these companies who are developing devices like this, obviously if they want to get their money back from all their R and D, they need to target it to the largest audience possible that's using Internet or has a desire to use the Internet, and that's consumers and in the traditional business sense people who want to make transactions and get services of some kind using technology.

Trying to develop a phone interface for the web is certainly not new. When I was with the Corporation for Public Broadcasting in '95, we funded the development of software that would allow the Link Coalition in New York to allow members of its volunteer programs to access their database of volunteer activities in the community. The way their program works, it's a time-dollar program where every time you do volunteer work you receive time-dollar credits and these credits can then be used in the community to buy tickets or go to community college.

The whole idea behind it is, if you look at low income communities, they don't necessarily have hard cash flowing within the community, but they have lots of needs and lots of services. So if you can create a barter system instead of a cash-based economy, then things will get done.

So they originally started developing this database online so people could find out what jobs, what jobs and volunteer opportunities were available, and what things they could request as well. So they asked to create this telephone device so I could dial in my password and have something be read back to me to tell me what's available and then I could speak to it and using a voice-to-text converter it would create a web page as well as a database entry on what my particular needs were.

Similarly, you've got products being developed for the disabled community. There's a new product, I forget what it's called, MYA, something to that effect, M-Y-A. The idea behind it was from creating a web-accessible device for the blind. But the ads that have been on TV in the last two or three weeks promoting this new software that comes out in a week or so has been very much: Now I can get tickets, now I can day trade and I can do all these other things.

No mention of people with accessibility issues, no mention of people with literacy difficulties.

COMMISSIONER BINGHAM: I think we have a network where we can reach those what are impoverished and who may never have them in their own homes. I'm speaking of the public libraries where we now have Internet available. I know in my community the branches all have Internet, and it's amazing. They have schedules of classes and it's amazing how many people from the projects and other places go in there spontaneously, learn to use the Internet, and copy down these www's when they see them on the television and then come into their local public library and use those places.

In fact, a number of our branch libraries now have a technician that stays all day, the hours they are open --

MR. CARVIN: They have to.

COMMISSIONER BINGHAM: -- because they are so much in and out, these people. The people are hungry for it, and we have the framework with the public libraries if others won't let it dribble down. You get it into those branch libraries serving those disadvantaged communities and others and they will seize the eagerness and then somebody will see it's commercially or intellectually expedient to bring them into the circle.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: I think in a way there has to be a PR campaign by the libraries of this country to say that we are the first community technology centers before anyone heard the term "CTC".

COMMISSIONER GRIFFITHS: We tried.

MR. CARVIN: Oh, I know, I know. It's a strange dynamic. I haven't figured out what's going on, but it took the term, it took the acronym CTC to suddenly get the government's attention by having this storefront community center where people could go in.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: You're going to have to tell us what "CTC" is.

MR. CARVIN: "CTC" means community technology center.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: And because we have an anti-acronym person sitting on his left -

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: And on his right.

MR. CARVIN: You have this network of local community centers called CTC's. Now, there are about community technology center that, without any government funding, without any assistance, were able to figure out ways to get funding locally and create places where people could come together and not only access the Internet, but to have access to literacy and training programs, to get them functionally literate, technologically literate.

In other words, they're doing the sort of things that many of the libraries were already doing, but no one was paying attention to, and at the same time a lot of public broadcasting stations were doing in some form or another.

So the big challenge is what can be done to take the momentum that has gotten behind the CTC movement, that now the federal government is buying into and have that get blended with what's going on in the libraries and what's going on with the public broadcasting stations.

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: And schools

MR. CARVIN: And schools, especially schools, because they've got all this e-rate funding to create these little computer labs, which aren't very functional in terms of educational activities, but if we could keep them open after school hours and turn them into community technology centers or education technology centers, if you will.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: José and then Joan, and then I'm going to say something.

COMMISSIONER GRIFFITHS: A couple of comments, one responding to what you were just saying before I get to my main point, and that is, yes, the community technology centers were put in place to give people access to the technology and the e-rate intent was to link every school building to the Internet.

The problem is at the community technology centers they really only went as far as technological literacy and didn't go further to true information literacy or what we're now calling information fluency, which is where I think we have to aim our science. So I don't think CTC's have done exactly what public libraries were doing. I think public libraries were always caking more than CTC's have been doing.

MR. CARVIN: I think some of them have. Most of them haven't.

Just to quickly respond to that, I think part of the problem is because it's too easy in the public and political worlds to simplify the issue of literacy.

COMMISSIONER GRIFFITHS: Absolutely.

MR. CARVIN: Because there's literacy in terms of whether you can read and whether you cannot, and then there's technology literacy, can you use Netscape. They don't see this whole spectrum of basic literacy, functional literacy, and information literacy, technological literacy, fluency, and all these other things.

Until we find -- until we're able to get all of these politicians, to be quite frank, to recognize that literacy is a very fluid spectrum of issues and then at the same time find ways to link these things together at the local level -- for example, you've got all these CTC programs, you've got the e-rate creating Internet-ready computer labs around the country, but has anyone thought to take any of the national literacy initiatives and link them directly to CTC's?

COMMISSIONER GRIFFITHS: Right, absolutely.

MR. CARVIN: Why not? Why not? They're both happening. Why aren't they paying attention to each other?

COMMISSIONER GRIFFITHS: Now, the point that I was really going to make before I responded is, it seems to me one way of thinking about how do you actually get the technologies to be fully integrated into people's normal mode of doing things or accessing information. It seems to me again we tend to think in terms of traditional approaches. You mentioned computer labs, we talked about computers in the classroom.

One of the things that I think we can do is begin to think of the population that have the easiest time with the technology, with any technology, and that is the children themselves, and get the children to become familiar with the technology and get them to staff or provide access, help others through at the CTC's, the public library, and so on, because they have an ease of use. They're not scared of the technology.

Anyone what hasn't put the technology on place now is probably somewhat intimidated by it, is not going to be the best person to show other people how to use it.

MR. CARVIN: You must have my Benton Internet password, because in the last ten minutes you've sort of referred to all the things I'm in the process of writing and haven't released yet.

But just to quickly respond to that, the answer is a resounding yes. All you have to do is take a look at any household or any school. It's the kids who get it. I once heard a sociologist describe this whole situation as an inverse power relationship that's not unlike what you see when an immigrant family comes to the U.S. The parents are not fluent in a particular thing, language. They don't know English, so their children become the intermediaries for the rest of society.

So if the encyclopedia salesman comes by or it's time to do the taxes, they have to rely on their kids. And it's a difficult cultural shift for them because they're used to being the authority figure.

The same thing you've got I schools, because teachers are used to being the authority figures and they feel undermined when they see that all of their students around them know so much more

than they ever will, and by the time they as a teacher master a particular Internet skill set the students are going to be ten steps beyond that.

But we do have -- we are just beginning to see programs around the country that are recognizing this reality, such as the Generation Y program in Olympia, Washington. What they've done there is they started with a Department of Ed challenge grant, I believe. They developed a curriculum where students would be trained as teacher technology mentors, so they'd come in early in the morning for like a zero period hour before school has actually started and spend the first nine weeks of the school year learning everything from how to do intelligent searching on the Internet too how to install new memory and keep the network running and how to respond to basic questions from teachers by learning education lingo that they may not hear normally.

So with the program in place, the students are then scattered throughout the classrooms, throughout the school, so there's at least one of these kids in every classroom at any given time. That student serves as the technology planner for that teacher. So they get together for half an hour every week after school and plan the teacher's technology needs.

Now, you've got that at one level. At another level you've got school districts and states across the country implementing community service credits. Why aren't we putting these two ideas together more often and having students be trained to become technology mentors at community centers, at community centers and libraries, and either connect them so they go in and specifically -- or they broadly become like a technology mentor at large, so you walk up to me and say, hey, I have a problem with this, can you help me.

Some students can do that. Other students can be specifically put together in sort of like a big brother, big sister, where the student is connected with a group at a retirement home or a particular family and they shadow that particular group for a length of time, so they develop an intimate mentoring relationship with them.

Some places are beginning to do it. There are some prototype programs in Massachusetts But besides that I haven't heard much.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Joan.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: I have a couple of things here. I think there's a great difficulty in America that something comes along, everybody gets excited, the White House holds a meeting, and six months later everybody's forgotten it. I think the digital divide exactly is the kind of thing. Everybody's now excited about the digital divide. The White House holds a conference, we hold a conference, everybody's got to hold one. Then six months later we're off to something else, and it cheats the children because nothing is ever finished.

At the same time, when India said they wanted to have literacy by ten we had a big program here, literacy by the third grade. What's happened to literacy by the third grade? I think we all know what's happened to that.

The third thing is, what you described about kids teaching other kids and teaching parents, that was called the Lancaster System and it was started in Lancaster, England, in the nineteenth century, and there are books about how this worked. It was to teach everybody literacy when people were coming off the English, the British farms. It was a very successful system and I believe it got taken to South America. That's from back here somewhere.

The third thing is, one has to be a little careful in sending children to teach teachers. One thing we don't have in this country is much respect from children to their teachers, and the undermining of any kind of adult ideas is rampant in our schools. I think you have to be very careful before you send kids to teach the teachers what the teachers don't know.

Network, on the other hand, if we want to have a school system where everybody is equal, teachers teaching kids, then we've got to have a new school system, because we don't have that now. It's built on the idea that ideas flow from the teachers to the kids, and some of these kids are going to be ten years old and I think you might be starting something in the school that you might be sorry about later.

MR. CARVIN: Well, I think you have to be intelligent about it.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: We can be -- I'm talking in the classroom.

MR. CARVIN: That's what I mean, that's what I mean. The Generation Y program, they just don't say, okay, we need kids, why don't you all come together and we're going to show you how to use the Internet so you can become a mentor. It's not that simple.

You've got to go -- there is an application process and you've got to prove that you have the maturity as well as the skill set to become a mentor, and if you don't you're not accepted.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: No, that's not what I'm talking about. It's the other kids in the classroom what are sitting there watching this kid teaching the teachers what they need to know. It's the other kids.

MR. CARVIN: Most of this happens after school or after class hours.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: And they don't talk to each other?

MR. CARVIN: In the classroom?

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: No, after school. I'm just saying -

MR. CARVIN: Oh, of course, sure.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: I'm just saying beware. This is a very tender subject.

MR. CARVIN: I haven't heard any complaints. They implemented over a thousand Generation Y projects last year and no one's done a comprehensive study, and I think that would be a very

important thing to look for. But I think they have put checks and balances into the system to make sure that the students they recruit are going to do what they're supposed to do and be conscientious about it.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: It's not those ones that I'm worried about.

MR. CARVIN: No, I know.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: Those are not my worry.

MR. CARVIN: But there's a certain diplomacy in the classroom certainly, and there are ways of doing it. It'll be good to find some research on it.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: It'll be interesting to see the results of this particular project.

MR. CARVIN: Anecdotally, it's very positive.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Jack, you wanted to say something?

COMMISSIONER HIGHTOWER: I need to be brought up to a level on what we're talking about generally. But first of all, on the CTC program, would you give me -- I'm sure this is common knowledge around here -- some background on it and then why that their agenda can't be broadened as José said?

MR. CARVIN: Well, I'll give you a history, but just to quickly say I don't think they're against what she proposed. It's more a matter of -- well, let me give you the history because this could explain it some.

Many of the original community technology centers that have evolved over the last five, ten years --

COMMISSIONER HIGHTOWER: Let me. They "have evolved"?

MR. CARVIN: Evolved.

COMMISSIONER HIGHTOWER: What was the impetus?

MR. CARVIN: Let me say. I'll explain. They evolved report what were essentially computer user groups. These were clubs in a community of tekkies, be it the group of sometimes nerdy young guys who like using computers and thought it would be fun to teach others about how computers work as well. Computer users groups have been around since the seventies and even before that there were mainframe users groups. Wherever there have been computers, there have been always people coming together saying: I think this is fun, I think this is a social activity as well as a professional and technical activity, so let's try the find ways to use it.

Over time as the Internet became available for these same tekkies in their universities and their places of work in the eighties, they decided that it would also be interesting to have Internet access at home or at least some kind of network access. So they started creating bulletin board systems. These were dial-up networks that you could connect your modem and dial up to this place, and there would be some very simple communication going on among friends.

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: Text-based?

MR. CARVIN: Text-based, old BBS stuff, and certainly not GUI. But they were really social activities so people could come together and talk about tekkie things.

COMMISSIONER HIGHTOWER: Did you belong to a users group?

MR. CARVIN: No, I didn't. When I was very young, like fourth or fifth grade, I was in an Atari group for a while. Actually, I'll give you a bit of my own personal history after I explain this story here.

But as the technology in the Internet, the networking, improved, they started finding that it was cheaper and cheaper to bring Internet access to themselves and so they thought, well, if I can get Internet access from the university, why don't I learn to become an Internet service provider as well. So they formed these nonprofit groups that were called freenets, or free networks.

The whole freenet movement was simply the idea that every citizen should have access the networking in order to gain access to reach all the things that were online. So a couple hundred freenets popped up around the U.S. in the late eighties, early nineties. Some of them are still around.

They evolved into things called specific networks or community networks, which are just formal associations of people in a given place who want to use the Internet for beneficial, nonprofit, noncommercial things, usually with a very civic-minded purpose.

In some of these cases, though, they realized that not everyone was going to have a computer at home, not everyone was going to be able to have a modem or pay for the Internet service. So they started working with libraries, working with public broadcasters, or finding store fronts.

COMMISSIONER HIGHTOWER: This is all very informal? There's no CTC --

MR. CARVIN: There is now. There is now. But over the course of the late eighties they started opening up these mom and pop store fronts where people off the street could come in and either for free or very low cost could access the local network.

COMMISSIONER HIGHTOWER: This was done by local entrepreneurs?

MR. CARVIN: They weren't even entrepreneurs. This was all nonprofit. None of this was for profit at this point.

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: It was very GIGI.

MR. CARVIN: It was very, very GIGI. These were computer nerds who decided they wanted their entire social life to revolve around technology as well, so they created technology- oriented social clubs.

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: But in some cases they were social reconstructionists. But in some cases, like in Santa Monica, they were not so much GIGI. They cared about the civic empowerment of the people of Santa Monica.

MR. CARVIN: Sure, and the Well is another good example.

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: They had so many homeless on line that they shut down the system. It was very interesting. There were so many problems.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: Say that again? There were so many homeless on line that?

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: It shut down the system.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: Why?

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Don't everyone speak at once.

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: Mary, you should use your microphone. Turn it on.

MR. CARVIN: It got too crowded, it crashed. The capacity was overloaded.

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: I want to say hi to my Commission members.

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: I think I should turn it on. Push that button.

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: And tell you that I'm feeling healthy today. It's nice to be back with all of you. My heart is beating fine, thank you. And thanks for chairing. It's a happy-sad occasion.

I have a lot of experience with these because I did --

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: I'm not sure your microphone's on. Push it towards you. Push that slide up.

MR. CARVIN: She did. Try tapping it.

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: Hi. I had quite a bit of experience with the freenets because I created Seniornet, which was a nonprofit and the first one, I think. So I got to meet some of the people, and my roots go deep with geeks because I was in a club in high school, too.

But what I found with the freenets is the characteristic was one-half geek and one-half social reconstructionist.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: We need to know what a social reconstructionist is.

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: You used to be one.

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: I'm really inadequate saying this to Joan Challinor, defining this term. What I would say is that these were -- in the city of Santa Monica, which is a good example, Jane Fonda was living there then, you might recall.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: No, I did not recall.

(Laughter.)

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: Well, she's gone through different phases. This was a pre- Ted Turner phase, and she was living in Santa Monica. The goal then was really to take the energy from the sixties and to apply it to local community issues and empower citizens to have a voice on all issues.

So you had in Santa Monica a pretty interesting case study because you had the RAND scientists on one side and the homeless people on the other and the library in the middle, and then you had a social entrepreneur that was creating a place where people could vote on issues in Santa Monica and communicate with the local government, the mayor, the council, and so forth.

Well, the homeless were so on line all the time that the biggest problem in that environment was shutting down the system because the homeless found all this creative --

COMMISSIONER HIGHTOWER: Were they using library facilities?

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: Yes, they were using library facilities. Now, the problem with some of those freenets, as you know, is that they lost their funding. I think a really interesting extrapolation from that, I think, is to look at what happened with LookSmart, because LookSmart is a company that's one of the top search engines on the web, that was founded by two people who led the student movement in Australia. For four years they led the student movement.

Now they are one of the key search engines, and now that they've made it they're really looking at how they could take ownership for social issues nationally in the country.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: Would you like to describe what that means, "take ownership of"?

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: Well, for example, to use the -- they discovered that -- I didn't know this -- that Emily's List is the most powerful PAC in America. That was a surprise to me. So they explained to me that Emily's List was a group of women activists.

COMMISSIONER HIGHTOWER: You just had to ask a politician.

(Laughter.)

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: I thought it was AARP, I really did. I didn't know it was Emily's List.

So what they were explaining to me is that if the new media community -- and this I think is the potential that people think about the digital divide -- got focused on the issues like really changing literacy so that we really taught all children to read, and this is what John Doerr cares about now. This is what a lot of new entrepreneurs who have made it care about. Maybe in a financial sense they're looking at how to give back.

So they said, if we wanted to take on something like gun control -- and I'm not arguing we should do this --

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: Go right ahead.

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: I'm not a fan of -- I mean, I would just like to see guns retired. They said if we took that issue on electronic lobbying could really make a difference with the number of people that could both give money and time to amass and focus on that agenda.

I heard last night about an anonymous check coming in to help the children in Kosovo of \$100,000 from an entrepreneur in Seattle. So I think we're just beginning to see the connection between social causes and the Internet entrepreneurs that care about them.

I was recently at a conference where one-third of the topics were about education, literacy, giving back, philanthropy, and the digital divide. I didn't think that they were - - well, I think a lot of people are mouthing the words. I think these were pretty sincere people with very large pocketbooks, very focused on it.

I think it's incumbent upon us to figure out what those people are and how we can support their efforts to really affect social change if that's what we're supposed to do. I'm not sure.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Andy, you had some comments, and then I think we should take about a five minute break. There are cold drinks and snacks. When we come back I have some comments I want to make and then I'm going to throw something at Emily and Betsy in terms of LSTA. So with that, Andy.

MR. CARVIN: I actually want to finish answering your question because I think I probably ended around 1989, 1990, just to end it very quickly. As you just said, while the freenet movement was going on there were certain groups who recognized that the technology could be

used for social change and not used creating Internet communities for Internet communities in their own right.

So different groups started to play around with the Internet as a civic network, a way to get people in the community to be mobilized around whatever issue they had there. So that there were lots of civic networks opened up. In Michigan, for example, during the recession when lots of industries were closing, they would use -- people would go online and use the Internet as a way of trying to find new educational opportunities for themselves and getting back on track with their jobs.

So by the time that the Internet became, started becoming more and more affordable and more ubiquitous, these community technology centers that had opened up started expanding their missions and saying, okay, we're going to have Internet access here, you can come in. We'll teach you how to use it, we'll show you how to get online at home if you have a computer, and if not we'll show you how to buy one at a cheap price.

At some point several years back, a group of these people running CTC's decided to form a consortium and they formed a group called CTCNET, which is now a consortium of around of these CTC's around the country, which are now working at a national scale to try to find ways of taking the capacity that they've begun to develop in community technology centers, expanding their mission so they address things like content and literacy better than they have so far, and use them as a primary way of bridging the digital divide in their communities.

So it was probably longer of a story than you wanted, but that's essentially how it evolved in a very general way.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Why don't we come back at about past and give everybody a chance for a third inning stretch.

(Recess.)

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: I think what I want to say here is that everything that has been said so far this afternoon is sort of working its way around what I think will eventually be some interesting policy issues. With that, I think, Betsy, you have some things you would like to say on this issue.

COMMISSIONER SYWETZ: My interest here really is turning it around from a more general conversation to one that's focused on the role libraries ought to play. The IMLS, of course, is the federal agency that administers the Library Services and Technology Act, which funds library services with a focus on technology. Many of the activities that we fund, both in the state library program and in the national leadership grant program and the Native American grant program all focus on how libraries can serve their communities.

Particularly, I think it's interesting that there is a blend on helping people who have difficulty using library services, whether it's from literacy or disabilities or a range of problems that interfere with library use and on the technology. So what we are doing is bringing those things together.

What I would like to hear this group discuss a little bit is the role that libraries can play creating partnerships with the community technology centers. I know some of the community technology centers our libraries, our libraries are involved with them. We were talking a little bit during the break about how community networks often involve libraries and some of the most successful ones had libraries playing a central role.

So that I don't have answers, but I would like to hear this group discuss strategic approaches to helping libraries be of more use in solving this problem and addressing the digital divide issues.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Denise.

MS. DAVIS: I'd like to respond to this. I'm going to tell a story about me in a prior life. Long ago and far away, 1994, I had the privilege of working with a group in Maryland who, under the leadership of their current state librarian, Maurice Trevillion, had this idea that a great way to use at that time LSCA funding, and with permission from the Department of Education, was allowed to keep two years of federal funding that would have normally gone to public libraries in Maryland through block grants and money that had traditionally been used for literacy programs or whatever the libraries wanted -- it was a competitive grant situation.

With permission from the Department of Education, Maurice was able to take two years of funding, which was a couple of million dollars, and had this idea that what he needed to do was to harness the Internet and bring it to public libraries. The public libraries were the place, at least in Maryland, where the community had traditionally come for information and they were going to come for electronic information.

So he put together a task group of people from higher education, from schools, from public libraries, and from special libraries in the state, as well as Maryland government, and got them all together, got those great brains together, and said: How are we going to do this?

Working with Bell Atlantic -- and fortunately, only having two telephone companies in Maryland made this fairly straightforward -- there are LATA's in the state and one phone company overlaps the state of Pennsylvania and it's really just one small town. So basically they were dealing with what is now Bell Atlantic.

After a couple of years of very hard work, they put in a telecommunications infrastructure using frame relay and lots of other things now, but basically empowered the library systems in Maryland to become Internet service providers, and that's what they have done. Carroll County, which is just north of Baltimore, north and west of Baltimore, is the shining example of a rural community that had nothing that is now providing Internet service for the county, for county government, for the colleges in their county.

They are the Internet service provider and they're making money on it. So that's a good thing.

MR. CARVIN: Are they doing that for the schools as well?

MS. DAVIS: Yes, they are. So this is one of those success stories that, with a little creativity and a lot of money and permission from the federal government to hold money over a couple of years and draw it down over time, they were able to put in a network that has, interestingly, not serviced the public libraries so much as it has served dial-in users from home.

This is a dial-in service, by the way. You can dial in from home with a local phone call and get access to the Internet, graphical or text-based still. But what it did is it created the infrastructure that the public schools used, because the government, the state government, was not prepared the fund that.

So the largest proportion of users are from 8:00 in the morning to 4:00 in the afternoon, with a peak from 1:00 to 4:00 in the afternoon. And you can look at the statistics. It's on their web site, and it's the schools that are dialing in.

The other interesting thing I think is that, unlike other state initiatives where they've looked at access and they've looked in terms of negotiating contracts for information, Maryland didn't do that. What they felt strongly about was the telecommunications infrastructure, which they still maintain, and it's managed out of the Pratt Library in Baltimore. Only last year did the state actually fund it, at \$2 million, but until that it was paid for on the backs of the public libraries in Maryland to make that infrastructure available to them.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Actually, some similar project in Nevada, where it was the state library that actually built the backbone and again the rural areas dial in for Internet access. Now there are a number of service providers, but the state has just given us I think another \$700,000 to complete the backbone. The libraries did it before state or local governments.

MS. DAVIS: That's right. And I think one more thing I want to point out is in the western part of Maryland there's a county called Garrett County and the illiteracy rate in that county when this network was put in was 30 percent. That illiteracy rate is below 20 percent now, and those are the kinds of stories that have to be told. It was because the schools and the community colleges could get access to the Internet through this backbone that they were able to improve the literacy rate in those communities.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Thank you.

Before we go any farther, I really must apologize. I was remiss in that I didn't give our guests a chance to introduce themselves, and would they please do so now.

MS. WEISS: Hi. My name is Nancy Weiss. I'm the General Counsel of the Institute of Museum and Library Services.

MS. RODGER: I'm Joey Rodger. I'm the President of the Urban Libraries Council.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: There was a gentleman.

MS. VLACH: Yes, from the International Journal. When last I saw him he was making a phone call.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Then we have a supporter of the library here, Ann Molod, who didn't introduce herself, so I will. She also happens to be my older sister.

Let us continue then. Beth. Beth.

MS. BINGHAM: Yes, ma'am.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: You had some comments that you made during the break.

MS. BINGHAM: Well, I was just -- as a front-line public librarian from a third world country, Louisiana, I think that there are some things that have been discussed here today that we need to have a reality check. I was wondering if the Commissioners are fully aware of the magnitude of Bill Gates' grants, of what is happening in the rural, the most impoverished places.

Becky's brought up some things about what's happening in schools and what's happening in libraries. Working day to day in a public library, a large public library in an area that traditionally has had a very upscale population visiting, to see the demographics changing -- you know, when Barnes and Noble moved into our community it was like a big thing, and our population is now in large part at Barnes and Noble day in and day out.

But what's happened with the free Internet labs and the availability of material is that we are having a changing population coming in from the time we open in the morning until we close at night. We're open hours a week, until 10:00 o'clock five nights a week. So we have a lot of traffic in and out of the building.

3:00 o'clock in the afternoon when school gets out, the children come in, and they not only come in with their brothers and sisters, but they come in with mom and dad, who've never had access to a computer, have no idea. And many of them cannot read or write, and they are sitting right there and the children are helping as teachers.

But what's happening more and more is the changing role of the library community and the resentment of the library staff of having to take on the role to be computer teachers. This is something I think really and truly is something that is a need throughout the country. Library staff are having now to take a whole different role of having to teach people, many that don't have any literacy skills at all, have very little computer ability, and also that it's often that it's whole families coming in at one time, and we have a - minute because of the lack of computers. And this is going on at all of our locations and the main library.

This is something that's not unique to Louisiana. It's happening in the rural communities. It's happening in the urban communities. It's happening all over the South where the Gates money is coming in.

I was talking with Richard not long ago, Richard Ackroyd, and he was saying that the impact of the availability of computers to the have-not's, as we used to refer to them, has made them relook at their project, because what they're finding is that libraries are not the only conduit for this. They need to go into the community centers, they need to go where there's an established network available, to the food stamp offices, to the distribution points, because there are many more outlets, and there will never be enough outlets to provide the materials that are available, that need to be.

These children will never have a computer to take home. The library cannot do it. And with time limits and with governmental restraints, it's not the end-all. So providing all this technology is terrific, but you have to be thinking about what's happening on the front end, who are your providers, who are the people that are providing these services, where are they getting the skills to be able to teach this type of material, and who is going to do the basic work to keep the library running day in and day out.

Your comment about the students coming in and being mentors and stuff like that, coming from a large municipal situation, no way, José. It is just not going to work in most municipalities, empowering students to come in to set up or to help or this, that, and the other, because we just have parameters that that will not work.

It sounds really good, but when it comes down to a practical day in and day out report -- and Betsy, I don't think I'm saying anything that you're not hearing from all over the country. But I think that we really and truly need to be very careful of what we're trying to provide.

I was up here a couple of weeks ago at a National Alliance for Urban Literacy meeting, and the literacy providers who are trying to teach people to read below a third grade level, adults, have a hard enough time with basic reading and writing and day to day life skills, and you add on computer literacy to that. Their plates are overflowing.

I always refer to it as a turkey platter that is totally just overflowing with so many things to do. What exactly is our mission? How do we get it out there? And is this the type of service that we should be providing day in and day out, to overshadow what traditional library service is all about?

There's an answer out there someplace and I think people are struggling. I'm working on an international project for the Commission and I was just reading about one of our libraries is paired with a school in Australia that has six students, but they have Internet connectivity and they have computers in that particular school, but only six students. So maybe we're looking at a whole different ballgame of the have's and have-not's.

In Charlotte at PLA a couple weeks ago, we had lunch with a lady who has a project going on in Zimbabwe and talking about the lack of equipment, the lack of running water, the lack of electricity. They don't really and truly care about the Internet. They want basic skills and services.

So I think that the whole gamut needs to be examined from, number one, what exactly are libraries, school, public, academic, whatever the name of it is, what exactly is our role in this? How are we going to equip the staff to be able to handle the people that are coming in that we've never served before, because we're reaching into a social arena that we do not have the basic skills to deal with this, and how can all this be incorporated to make the digital divide evaporate?

We can make it work in Louisiana, where we do have Internet connectivity in all library systems and we've been on the upper front. We got more money from Gates than anybody else because we're so poor and we are just so illiterate, and we're bringing people in, but we're giving them a taste of what they want, and you give them that taste and then they don't have it and the demands become so much that we are just truly struggling for day to day existence.

So basically that's my two cents worth.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: I'd like to ask whether we are asking libraries to do that which the schools should be doing.

(Pause.)

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Don't everyone speak at once. Denise and then Abe.

MS. DAVIS: Well, I've worked with a lot of library types, so I had the opportunity to work in an extremely affluent county, also in Maryland, where when you look at census demographic information about the community there are -- they claim to have advanced degrees in every household. Well, we know that's not true, but what it does mean is that in some households there are multiple advanced degrees among the parents and in other households there are no advanced degrees, but when you look at them demographically they look very well to do.

The per capita income revenue going into the public libraries in this particular community is \$43 per capita. So that's per person. That's quite a lot. I mean, they have a lot of money to work with, so there's a lot going on there.

At the same time, you have very good schools, many of them magnet schools, advanced programming. But in this particular community the schools and the public libraries do not speak to one another. When they built these libraries, they built the schools and the libraries right next to each other, separated by a hockey field or something. And in this particular community they just don't speak to one another.

The sad thing is they sort of fobbed off on one another: Well, you know, the after - school program is not really our thing; you know, we don't want to deal with young adults coming into the library. The schools are saying: Well, we want to have our own libraries, we don't want you going to the schools.

So there was really not good communication, despite the revenue flowing in this particular county. So I put that out as an opportunity too just talk about it. Where you would think in a

community where there's plenty of money and there's a lot that could be done, they're not doing it. They're simply not talking.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Abe.

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: Montana's not the only state in which there are and have been attempts to change the law, such as not to require school districts too have anyone certified in library service. We have 500 -- now we're down to 495 school districts in Montana, which doesn't make any sense on the face of it for 800,000 people. But below a certain size there never was a requirement to have anyone certified in library services and there are attempts to take that all away.

So as bad as it's been in the past, the school systems are shifting more and more of the burden onto public libraries. This is at the same time, as we've just discussed, that the reference desk is being charged with giving someone their first trip on the Internet.

I know a couple other states that they're also de-emphasizing school libraries as libraries. Certainly I think the trend is wrong, but the status today is that libraries are doing a lot of what most taxpayers think school systems are doing.

I would imagine in my small community in the Hub of Five Valleys that most high school term papers are researched and written in the public library specifically.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Betsy.

COMMISSIONER SYWETZ: I would just like to point out that the biggest failure in schools in this nation are in the urban centers. There are places where the dropout rate exceeds 50 percent, as mind-boggling as that is. I think that if we are going to address this issue of digital divides and people who know how to use information to meet their basic needs, we're going to have to have everyone stepping up to the plate in different ways.

I think that that's an exciting opportunity for libraries because I think that the fact that we're looking at this issue of the digital divide being an important issue suggests that people are concerned about this. We absolutely cannot have a just and equitable society where half the kids that go to school in urban schools drop out and are not functionally literate, are not able to do anything in our society.

What I would like to see is more programs that try to create synergy between schools and the public libraries. One of the focuses at IMLS is the idea of meeting community needs, building healthy communities. I think that there is a crying need in this country, and in part it's because of our technological success, for this sense of community and the meeting human needs through communities, whether they're virtual, as some innovative networks have produced, or whether they're actual physical communities.

I think that's another area where libraries can really make a difference. I guess that what I really would like to see is a funding source that would allow libraries to have more of a leadership

opportunity than they currently have. At this point the LSTA program is \$166 million and that really is the only federal funding that focuses particularly on libraries. There are many other opportunities, but if we could somehow enhance the ability of libraries to be leaders and to develop creative new solutions I think it would be really beneficial.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Rebecca.

COMMISSIONER BINGHAM: It seems to me that in so many of our urban areas where we do have such a high dropout rate -- our community is not unusual in having nontraditional kinds of high school programs that are almost totally focused on the use of the Internet and the other technology and the individualized technological approaches to learning. And they are graduating with very high averages those who would otherwise have been dropouts or been in somebody's prison today.

We are sort of keeping up with and tracking these students and seeing where they're going and a number of them are going to colleges. When we do this, we have to make school libraries available to them. I do feel that we put a burden on public librarians, who have never had the training in how to teach. There is an art to teaching, and when you're doing all the other demographic things that public librarians are called upon to do, then expected to monitor and teach in the evening when the youngsters come in, I think we're putting a burden on them.

I do feel that we definitely need to expand perhaps the scope of the school library. I think we were nuts to start calling them media centers and everything else. They're libraries, all the way back to Rome. Biblotecque was always a library, no matter whether it was Paris or whatever. At any rate, they should still be that.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: I agree.

COMMISSIONER BINGHAM: Because once you teach the youngsters to go to libraries and those libraries give them what they need, they will become your financial supporters of every other kind of library they ever have. And as the technology gets more and more expensive, they're your voters and that's where your voting base will come from. As long as they see this as ancillary, they will not fund it.

But many of these coming out of the nontraditional programs that have relied heavily on these things -- and I've done a little monitoring in some of these centers where these youngsters are working, and also now there are even ways to track whether or not those kids are plagiarizing. You can track that very easily technologically.

These kids are coming out more sophisticated than some of those coming out of our elite magnet schools because of their technological literacy.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Joan, then Betsy.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: I just wanted to say what I have said when I was watching the IMLS discussions of who's going to get grants. The only tool I think you people have at IMLS is

replicability. If you give a grant to something that cannot be replicated, then in my view -- and goodness knows I could be wrong -- you haven't done what you ought to do, and that replicability of these grants, of what these people propose, is of overriding importance.

Then the next thing is to publicize, which is a big piece of it. In other words, if we had the second coming today and nobody heard about it, it wouldn't have happened. So if you have the replicability and you have these grants which can be replicated, then there has to be a system to get that word out so other libraries can do it.

But I think you have a great opportunity as long as you keep your eye on that.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Joey and then Mary.

MS. RODGER: I apologize for entering the conversation late.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Do you want to introduce yourself for the record?

MS. RODGER: Joey Rodger.

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: I think you have to turn it on.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Pull the switch toward you.

MS. RODGER: That sounded live. Joey Rodger with the Urban Libraries Council.

I want to get back to the question of whose job this is. Robert Bellows the sociologist has written a book called "The Good Society" and in it he says institutions are socially organized ways of paying attention. What a public library is organized to pay attention to is education and equity. We are part of America's leveling of the playing field: free public education, free information. If public libraries can't figure out how to participate in positive ways in closing the digital divide, they don't understand the business they're in. And it may mean that they have to let go of some other stuff, some stuff that they love to do. But this is a part of why they are publicly funded institutions in America.

They are stressed because they are trying to run two businesses, the old book business and the new technology business. But part of any public institution's responsibility is to remember why it's a part of a public financed system in this country.

This is my opinion, not the opinion of the Urban Libraries Council, but I feel very strongly that if we are not participants in the digital divide issues we don't understand who we are.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Mary and then Woody.

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: That was a very eloquent comment, I thought.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: Is your microphone on?

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: I think so. Hi. I feel a responsibility here to have in the minutes, if not in the forum, a discussion about the fact that people 50 and older -- I have two friends retiring this week, so they're retiring at younger and younger ages. When I asked my friend yesterday what she was going to do, she said she's going to be volunteering for all the teenagers in the community. Her name was going to go on everybody's emergency card. So out of law into the emergency card for all of us the have children, which is really a nice thing, to see that.

I use that as a segue into the fastest growing segment online, the people what spend more time online and the people who understand the values I think the transmit in the culture the children, are older adults. So some of you that know me know my oldest student's 102 and my youngest was 3. So I've worked with a lot of students in between.

But the most talented students, the ones with the most time, the most to contribute, are those and older. That's a large untapped resource that has to be brought the bear to bridge the digital divide.

Now, in California where things are trendy the digital divide is on the agenda at every conference. So it's Carly of HP on the digital divide and this one on this on the digital divide. I sort of feel like I was in the digital divide before it was cool here in Washington with my Seniornet members.

But now we've got a million people that are to in our age group and we find that eight out of ten have health problems. When they have health problems they often have to change jobs, and that becomes a tremendous resource because what matters most as you get older is the legacy you leave and the kind of energy you bring to the situation.

So I've been in education a long time and I have been sort of really frustrated that I haven't made a very big difference in schools at all. So then I was on the Commission almost five years and I don't think I made a very big difference in libraries. So now in honoring the previous leader that we had, Jeanne Simon, I feel sort of a sense of how do we mobilize both the interests of the technology community, the talent and knowledge base of our older adult population that is online and knows how to go online and is very patient when you get them online, and how do you take the money and the talent and apply them to this problem.

I don't quite know the answer, but those are some of the data points that I bring to bear to share. I think the time is ripe for a real national campaign to get behind something like this, because you've got people that are really interested in it now. So the time and the leadership I think passes to the Commission as a sense that we can frame some agendas.

I just got off the phone with Mr. Toyota, what's the chairman of Sony, and he said: What are you doing? I said: I'm at a meeting on the digital divide. And he said: Oh, we just donated Dreamcast machines the X number of schools in the inner city and we want to see; if that works,

we'll do it to all of California. I said: Well, if you do all of California and it works, we could do it all around the country.

But people are used to donating machines. Apple did that before. People are not used to donating time and talent and repurposing or saying to people turn the sailboat a bit. So I'm just asking you maybe, Martha, what can I do in the next three to four months, in the last thing, to kind of make a difference in a way to highlight some of these real issues?

I almost think it takes an angel. I think Melinda Gates was the angel behind the things that happened with the Gates Foundation. She was that angel. And I'd like to think of a way to kind of personalize this and kind of carry some of Jeanne's leadership that inspired so many of us into mobilizing this energy and giving back to libraries and getting people behind that.

I think it's partly why we're all here.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Thank you, Mary.

Woody.

MR. HORTON: I see from our program that --

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: It's not on. On the bottom.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: There will be a lesson later on how to get your microphone on.

MR. HORTON: Is it on now?

The topic that we're talking about today was under the heading "Digital Divide and the Role of the Commission," but there's been very little discussion about the role of this Commission, and perhaps that's as it should be because we need to listen to the substance of the conversation.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: That is correct.

MR. HORTON: But I've had the advantage of sitting here and listening up to now to this conversation and I think there are some common denominators here that have been talked about. One of the things that stands out in my mind is the confusion and the overlap between the missions and roles of the country's major players in trying to close the digital divide.

I'm thinking about confusion between the school and the public libraries, between the federal, state, and local role, between the private and the public sector, and one could go right down the line with this kind of a duality, dichotomy in roles and missions. So what I'm suggesting I think is that one modest role the Commission might consider playing is to try and sharpen the redefinition of roles of the country's major players in trying to close the divide, beginning hopefully with a much clearer understanding of what these issues and concerns are, because again, sitting here and listening, I'm not even sure that I understand what closing the digital divide means.

I think it's a lot in the eyes of the beholder. And unless those issues and concerns are spelled out with a much broader consensus, a shared consensus among those key players, I can't imagine how anybody's going to get very far in trying to close that divide.

So whether that's done using the Commission's conventional modalities of public hearings or by a study or whatever, that is a relatively modest and doable kind of a task that could be undertaken and I think could be very valuable to all the players, including the Digital Divide Network.

MR. CARVIN: If I could just jump in, one of the things that we're trying to do at the Digital Divide Network, or actually, more specifically, what we're trying to do at the Benton Foundation, is lay the framework for creating, if you will, a digital divide manifesto, some kind of ten-page document or so that really hits it right on the head what the digital divide is all about.

I've lost track of the number of definitions for "digital divide" that I've heard in the last six months. But ever since the words "digital divide" came out of Steve Case's mouth and President Clinton's mouth in November and December at the summit, I've heard definitions ranging all the way down to credit card companies putting out press releases saying that they're bridging the digital divide by offering low interest credit cards to poor families.

It's that sort of thing. The term has become so trendy and so hip, it's been subsumed by commercial interests to use it in whatever they see fit. So what we want to do is, over the next couple of months create some kind of document -- hopefully we'll get some funding to publish it -- that really tries to reclaim the term "digital divide" and explain in a reasonable amount of detail the various issues that relate to it.

We've hit upon many of them already. Of course, access and infrastructure are a part of it, but it also has a lot of issues related to literacy, training of the work force. It has to do with content, content that's coming down to an individual as well as the ability for the individual too create content for their community and for themselves when the market fails them.

There are all these issues that do need to be addressed we're hoping that over the next couple of months we'll be able to craft such a document. So once that's done, if we are able to come up with a working definition of these attributes that make up the digital divide, we can then do an asset mapping of what institutions and what organizations have the ability to serve, fulfill those roles, to solve those particular attributes.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: I'd like to say something if I could. I was in England recently when Mercedes Benz sold Rover and 90,000 people, 9,000 workers at the Rover plant, came one after the other, not all 9,000, but they will be thrown out of work when the people who bought it can't make it go, came on, a representative number of people came on television, and they were without the vaguest idea what they were going to do when they lost their job.

I thought to myself, this is training, this is a retraining problem, this is what this is all about. But there was not one single discussion that I heard about that these people, these 9,000 people, need to be given schooling and retraining as soon as the jobs are no longer there, and it was widely assumed that the jobs would not be there very long.

But it was an opportunity to see what happens when there is a national problem that technology is not brought to bear upon. In other words, it wasn't even thought of that these people should be trained. You were there too, Bob; remember?

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Bob and then Mary.

MR. WILLARD: I just want to add, again for the sake of the record, two factors about the term "digital divide." I asked a friend of mine to do a search in NEXIS to see when it first showed up and he found a story in May of '95 in something called World Times, Inc., World Paper. I don't know what that is, but if a dateline Silicon Valley appearing in the New York Times carries any weight, it's January 29, 1996, when the term showed up in a New York Times headline: "A new gulf in American education, the digital divide."

There are about 100 stories that showed up in this selective file. I'm sure it shows up thousands of times in the news.

The other measure that may be of interest is in the Congressional Record. I went to the Congressional Record on KPL Access and searched year by year. In '95, '96, and '97 it showed up one time, in '96, and that happened to be in the report of the Telecommunications Act. In '98 it showed up three times. '99, 31 times; and so far in this year, three and a half months into this year, times. So the term is definitely around.

MR. CARVIN: We actually did a similar look on the Internet to see if we could trace the origins of it, because we wanted to give credit where credit was due. We read an article that was -- I think it might have been in the New York Times and gave credit to coining the term "digital divide" to Bill Gates, which all of us knew wasn't true.

Our leaning was to give the credit to Larry Irving at NTIA because he was certainly the person who popularized it. But whether or not he came up with it himself, he wasn't even sure.

So we went on to see what we could find. Of course, Al Gore could take some credit for it, but anyway -- though he did invent the term "information superhighway" or certainly popularized it back in '78-'79, so give the guy some credit.

So we went on to see if we could find an early reference to the digital divide, at least in the terms of this context. The oldest reference to the term in any form we found, going back to like '93, '94, in a Grateful Dead discussion on USENET, referring to someone who had just switched from using analog tapes to digital tapes to record Grateful Dead concerts and said that he's finally bridging the digital divide with his recording hobby.

Then there was nothing for like two years. So then finally around early '95 we did find a reference, or actually it may have been mid-'95, a reference by Bonnie Bracie, who at the time was on the NAI Advisory Council, that Al Gore, President Clinton and Al Gore had put together and Ron Brown had championed, and it was in the context of one of those meetings that Bonnie was discussing the digital divide.

Now, I've asked Bonnie about it and she said she didn't coin it herself; she knew it came from that group.

But clearly it was around that time and the NAI Advisory Committee I think should get a lot of credit for being one of the first groups to focus the issue and sort of explain where we might be going with this over the coming years.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: Jack Hightower would like to say something.

COMMISSIONER HIGHTOWER: Andy, you referred two or three times about everyone's suggested that what they're doing is to bridge the digital divide. I think that if we want to bridge the digital divide, let's think of it in terms of a suspension bridge, which is supported by cables. Everyone that wants to add a wire to the cable, that's fine, and we're seeing they're doing it. We have even trouble fully defining what the digital divide is.

Surely there are going to be many, many ways that these efforts to step across, to reach someone that has not been reached before, is part of an effort to bridge the divide. So I think that I endorse what you say, except I don't want anyone to have the impression that someone is claiming to do and they're really not doing it. If they're adding a wire to the cable, they're doing it.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: Thank you. I'd like to say that, although I'm an enthusiastic Gore backer, I never knew where the information superhighway was going.

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: Your microphone's not on.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: Well, maybe it wasn't worth having on.

I don't know and I've never understood, and I felt myself too out of it to ask, where is the information superhighway going?

MR. CARVIN: It's going to the world of the dot-coms.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: Is that a world we want?

MR. CARVIN: Well, of course there are still the dot-edu's and the dot-org's out there. But the revolution in Internet access in individual use has occurred because of the dot-coms, the for-profit Internet service providers, and the software developers and all these other groups.

When you take a look at what the NAI Advisory Council was doing, they wanted to make sure that there was universal access to a noncommercial educational network.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: And the noncommercial is the information superhighway?

MR. CARVIN: Well, the information superhighway is everything. It's the entire mass of information that gets networked.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: And where is it going?

MR. CARVIN: It's going wherever society takes it. It's everything. It's the Internet.

COMMISSIONER HIGHTOWER: Joan.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: Jack wants to answer, and then Mary, in that order.

COMMISSIONER HIGHTOWER: Where does the interstate highway system go? It goes everywhere. It doesn't go just from New York to San Francisco or New York to Los Angeles. The interstate highway system goes everywhere, and I think that ours, it's good to call it a superhighway, because you can head out in one direction and wherever you want to go and you'll find some highway that you can branch off on.

So I like the analogy of information superhighway. But it doesn't mean it's just a four-lane highway from point A to point B. It's a whole network of connecting links.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: Mary.

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: I've been inspired by the comment that you referred to Bob Bellow's book and building institutions. I think Joan's comment about what happened in England is really important for us to listen to, because if you read Newsweek last week with Doonsbury on the cover and the boomer generation, we're finding now with 38 percent of the boomers have -- 78 percent of boomers 46 to 64 have two parents when they're 40, 38 percent have one parent when they're 50. So in record numbers they're losing their parents.

In record numbers they're getting downsized from jobs. In record numbers they're having health problems and, guess what, they didn't save enough, too. So this is a generation that -- in my new book, I'm finding out 90 are in debt, 90 percent. This is shocking. This is not their parent's generation. It's not the Tom Brokaw, honor thy generation.

Their generation thinks if they have \$100 on their credit card they're rich, you know, if it's not maxed to the limit. So it's a very different psychological generation that's being brought to bear.

One of the themes of the presidential campaign that I found quite interesting was the use of community colleges as a training ground for people, mid-career change, mid-life change. So when we look at the record numbers of boomers that are going to divorce, change jobs, because record numbers after they lose a parent they change their jobs and change their professions,

because if their father told them to be an attorney and then they didn't want to be an attorney they're out of there.

So this is all well documented statistical information that you can go get access to. But what it really is talking about is Joan's point: Where is it all going and what's going to happen? So we're going to see plates of change happen right now, and I think the Commission is in a position to say what are the kinds of touchstone parts of the bridge where you can attach a cable to and where do we really want it to go? What are the real social aims that are important in a civic society that we would say let's educate.

I mean, I think we have a responsibility to educate children through technology. I think we have an even greater responsibility to capture the wisdom of our older citizens and reinvigorate that in society, much as Mali is doing, where they give them leadership roles no matter, all throughout society. If you're a senior citizen in Mali, you choose. You can be a leader in whatever segment of society. It's the only society I know that does that well.

Everybody else is trying to figure out how to pay their social security, not how do we use them as a resource.

So I think the digital divide has to reach both ends and I think we have to think about what are the two parts of that suspension bridge, and I think we have to ask the tough questions. If we're going to invest in the superhighway as we should, where is it going to go and what's it going to accomplish when you get there? Because I don't want them just going the porno sites and I don't want them just playing games and I don't want them just doing stock market tips.

I'd like to see world peace. I'd like to see equal access and sharing of knowledge. I'd like to see a cultural revolution. I'd like to see family histories being shared.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: Well, Andy spoke before you came in about the commercialization and with great courage. Andy, you get a lot of credit.

MR. CARVIN: If I could just say this very quickly, essentially what I said was that the Internet and the way it's evolved in the last couple of years treats citizens as consumers, people what buy stuff and services, as opposed to being community members and producers of information. One of the things we want to do in this piece when we at Benton write what the digital divide is all about, we'd like to say that the ability to produce content or the individual's ability and the community's ability to produce content that's relevant to that community and the rest of society is an inherent aspect of the digital divide.

If you don't give people the tools to share their wisdom and their experience and be able to make it available to others and have them be seen as the assets that they truly are, then all we're doing is treating everyone as consumers from someone coming from the top down.

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: I really disagree with that, and let me explain why. I don't think anyone has empowered people more to share their knowledge and to communicate than the

people that created MSN and AOL and Compuserve and Delphi. I don't think anyone has given back more than some of the new media entrepreneurs.

The greatest level of philanthropy in this country is coming out of new media entrepreneurs.

MR. CARVIN: I don't disagree with that at all. That's absolutely correct.

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: So my point is by saying -- if you look at the success of things like Yahoo and AOL, it's a lot come from giving people activities and resources to publish. So that's why they're putting these things in the schools, so they can give access to those tools.

So I think the notion of yes, it's been focused on to consumers, but to what end?

One of the ends has been to empower people with tools, to give them a voice, so that children are now advocating on issues.

MR. CARVIN: But at the same time you've got companies like AOL who are defining their interface devices as channels, TV channels. So when you go to their web site they're treating users as these passive people who are just getting information.

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: Not so. You ask Barry Shuler and he will say that the user-created publishing part of AOL has much more traffic than the channels. And anyone who drills down on that and looks at the AOL prospectuses, they'll tell you that the reason they just made AOL member services, creative writing and publishing, and all those special interest groups, Jewish special interest group, Christianity special interest group, is because they see that that's where the people are.

The same thing with Yahoo. Those member boards are more impactful almost than some of the citizen freenets, in my opinion. Now, I may be wrong. You could educate me.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Before we go to Joey --

MR. CARVIN: I've also got to go in about two minutes.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Okay. Emily had something she wanted to discuss and then Joey.

Andy, I can't tell you how much we appreciate your being here.

(Applause.)

MR. CARVIN: I wish I could have stayed. Unfortunately, I've got another speaking engagement, about the digital divide of course.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Well, undoubtedly we will get back to you.

MR. CARVIN: Great, and thank you for helping me focus. I'm about four blocks from here.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: And thank you to the Benton Foundation from us for letting you free.

MR. CARVIN: Any time, please. And by all means --

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: Do you have a card?

MR. CARVIN: I have some. There may be a few more left. Otherwise I can just give you my e-mail address. It's really easy. It's Andy@benton.org. Also, I would encourage all of you to visit the Digital Divide Network web site.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Actually, I'm on it.

MR. CARVIN: Yes, you are. And I would also encourage you to join the listserv. Well, that's what you're on. We've created a Digital Divide Listserv that has about 650 people on it, and it's a very vibrant group of people who are robustly debating what the digital divide is all about and all of these issues we've been discussing here.

If you're interested in joining, the easiest thing to do is probably just to send me an e-mail.

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: Join the listserv or join the network?

MR. CARVIN: The listserv. There is no way to join the network right now because right now the network is a consortium of about 20 companies and foundations. So until we're able to install the interactive tools on the web site that allows individual membership, the only thing close to individual membership is the listserv.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: The listserv is absolutely fascinating. I also get the communications headline.

COMMISSIONER HIGHTOWER: Madam Chairman, may I suggest that you give Andy the roster of our names and addresses and information and ask him please to list all the Commissioners.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: I will do that.

MR. CARVIN: Is it in the packet already?

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Yes.

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: You have the yellow one, but the green one has some corrections on it.

MR. CARVIN: Great. What I'll do, I'll actually send you, all of you, an e-mail to tell you that I'm going to add you to the list. So if for any reason you don't want it to be that e-mail address or you just don't care to be --

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: Then we shouldn't be on the Commission.

MR. CARVIN: Fair enough.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: I think some of the staff may already be on, Denise, Judy, and myself. Bob?

MR. WILLARD: I get what you forward.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Thank you.

Emily.

MS. SHEKETOFF: Hi. Thank you very much. I'm sorry I had to leave briefly, but there was another conversation about digital divide with the medical librarians.

I wanted to just hark back to the conversation before we went on the break. Someone wondered why libraries weren't more being considered as answers to the digital divide, rather than these community technical centers. An excellent question, a question I wrestle with every day, and I think that there are a number of factors that play a part in that. Some we'll never be able to do anything about. Others, we're looking for creative solutions and I'm totally open to them.

Many people feel that libraries sort of fit into the education mold and so they look at libraries as part of the Department of Education. And we don't really fit, although school libraries are part of the education. So public libraries and specialty libraries and the other libraries are not. In after-school programs, which is one of the ways we are trying to address the digital divide for K through 12, very few school libraries are open after school, and if they are they're only open as long as the school is open, so they probably close at 5:00 o'clock.

That is not a good way to a child to do his or her homework. He or she is going to need access to the information on the net after 5:00 o'clock when they'll probably be doing their homework. So they need to go to the public library, but they need to have access in some other way.

A lot of these community technical centers are growing up, having more resources invested in them, because they're seen as a way to get more children involved, keep them involved after school, in those critical 3:00 to 8:00 p.m. hours when there's a great effort to get those children off the street and into some meaningful activity.

Again, the public library most of the time is open in those hours and they would be the logical place. But the people what are talking about what shall we do with those children are thinking the way the library was when they went to the library 20, 30, 40 years ago, or they're thinking about the school library and they realize that this is not going to work.

So we in the American Library Association have a great communication probably in communicating the new library and what the new library is doing, and I'm working very hard to do that. But I could really use NCLIS' help.

Also, there are a number of programs that -- certainly the Clinton administration is trying to have an impact in this digital world and they see the logical way to do that as these community technical centers because they can control the funding that way. It goes directly from either a foundation or the federal government right to the center. The libraries are messy, they are locally funded, have state funds, and the federal government really can't control that. So it's not as attractive. And you don't have as much time as you're going to need -- there is less than a year to go in the Clinton administration -- to get involved with trying to work out some sort of funding stream with the governor or the governor and then the county executive and then the local executives. They recognize that this is not something that they can do before the end of the administration, so they're not as likely to look to libraries as maybe some other things where they can have an immediate impact.

So we in the library world need to overcome these small hurdles and come up with ways that we can address the problems that these present and get the libraries in the place where they should be.

Now, for the first time, last Tuesday the President did mention libraries and the digital divide in the same paragraph. So that's beginning. You know, baby steps. So we are starting with that, but that's not enough. He is going on this new market tour addressing the digital divide, trying to bring corporate and public attention to those areas in the country where the economy has not had the positive impact it has had in many other places.

We are trying very hard to get him to go to a library as one of his stops. At the moment we're still in the running for someplace in North Carolina. So if anybody has any influence with the Commerce Department or the President, that's what we're pushing for.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: I have a question. If NCLIS were to help you as you just asked, what would the help look like?

MS. SHEKETOFF: Well, I think that if you could encourage whomever your contacts are in the White House staff of the importance of the symbolism of having the President go to a library and talk about these issues and the part that libraries can play in addressing these really critical issues for this country, it will do a lot to raise the profile of libraries and what they're doing.

We have suggested to them a number of very innovative programs that use both government money, foundation money, and local partnerships in the community to address the problems of these specific communities. So we're just looking to sort of break through onto the next level.

I would be happy to give whomever the list of all the places we've suggested at the moment.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: Why don't you just send us a list of what you would like us to say.

MS. SHEKETOFF: Will do.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: It's interesting that you should bring that up because tonight when we give out the first of the awards, there are two community libraries, one a very -- well, actually one is a school library, both in fairly -- well, in very rural, poor areas, who have done extraordinary things with partnerships with all kinds of organizations, so creative, and these are poorly funded, but they've taken some of the federal dollars, they have parlayed -- it's extraordinary.

Indeed, I think perhaps we ought to send to the White House the names of these two libraries, one in Wyoming and the other in southern Alabama, the name of which I still can't pronounce because I still lisp on occasion. They're a perfect example of what they are doing to increase and improve the economy of their communities.

MS. SHEKETOFF: Absolutely. Libraries really are the community. They work for the entire community. The library is the location where people come to learn, lifelong learning, learning before you begin school. It's the place that opens up the world to many children, and it does it in a very effective way.

Libraries have traditionally taken just a small amount of public money and used it very creatively and developed great partnerships and they have been the recipients of foundation money over a hundred years and have really done something with it to directly serve their communities.

So there's no reason why the library should not be the centerpiece as we move into addressing this new literacy issue. We think of it as an information literacy issue more than a digital divide, because it's not going to be enough just to have the hardware and the software and it's not going to be enough just to know how to click the mouse. You really need to learn how to use the Internet and you really need to learn how to assess information because, pardon my French, there's so much crap on the net that you really need to be able to evaluate the information and pick out what can be useful and what really is not.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Thank you.

Joey.

MS. RODGER: I seem to be about six issues back, but I want to go back to Woody's question about what can the Commission do and make a couple of suggestions respectfully to you all. One is the role of research and the key piece in research. Your job as I understand it is to advise the President and to advise the Congress.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Right, correct.

MS. RODGER: There needs to be one place to go to find out what's really happening on the cutting edges of the digital divide. For you all not to seize that I think is an opportunity deeply missed. I would suggest that the unit of analysis for research on the digital divide is not what libraries are doing, but where people are getting it and what they're getting and what kinds of

help they need, and that an annual survey, that is a survey of households, together with the research that says this is what libraries are doing, is the kind of advice if I were sitting on Capitol Hill that would be useful to me, because this is neutral description of the territory. It's not the advocacy advice that comes with knowing just about what libraries are doing.

So that's suggestion number one and I'm happy to elaborate on the kinds of questions that I think need to be answered, and at some level have taken a bit of a stab the an IMLS grant that Dr. George DeLea and I serve as co-principals on. But somebody needs to follow up on that. We'll have data at the end of the summer and we're happy to give it to you.

I think the second thing is that this deep urgency about connectivity and training is of utmost temporary importance. It is important, it is vitally important. In five years it won't be important any more. Palm Pilots and better software will make the net accessible to almost anybody and everybody what needs it for \$455 and free e-mail if you can submit to advertising, which is just the way we do television, and the household penetration for television is no longer a function of economics.

It is in fact -- and I wanted to take issue with Andy a little about how awful commercialization is. That's what's made it worthwhile for people to get it. And it may not be your taste, it may not be my taste, but it is why people sign up in many cases.

And if we can pump education and civic discourse and stuff through those same channels, hurray. But people are not going to buy a Palm Pilot for civic discourse in most households in America. We'd like that to be the case. It's not.

Secondly, I guess what I'd like to suggest as a role down the pike for you all when we get beyond the access issues is a role in content. Now, the last thing I'm suggesting to a group of distinguished presidential appointees is that you slap your label on stuff on the Internet because I think that would be inappropriate.

I do think that the library community in this country has abandoned the place where it can really add value in the world of the Internet, which is the evaluation of sites. I think there is a plan waiting to happen that is a shared, collegial, specific plan that distributes among the libraries of this country the responsibility on a voluntary basis for vetting web sites and for doing a Library of America Good Housekeeping Seal on those that are accurate, that are stable, and that are extremely useful, the same thing libraries have done for books in all of their history.

The putting together of that kind of network requires national leadership as well as requiring money. I think there are libraries who would want to participate, there are libraries who don't. But it is silly to be creating lists of 20,000 recommended web sites in every library in this country as it was to do original cataloguing in the fifties. OCLC came into being saying we can do this jointly. I think there is out there the very real possibility for a new entity that has the "library" word in it, or we're toast on the net.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Thank you, Joey. I really appreciate those comments and I would like to go a little bit farther and suggest the role of research, or your points one and two as well as your point three, if you would sort of put it in writing and flesh it out a little and get it to us.

MS. RODGER: Sure.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Thank you.

Mary.

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: I just want to say I think those are brilliant ideas, and I think that I received a nice note after being runner-up for the Webbie Awards last year and I was really interested in watching what the Webbie Awards were like because they were -- someone came up to me and said they voted for me, but they voted for me in the wrong category, which made me kind of wonder what they did as they looked at it.

I think the notion of authority, the most trusted authority, librarians, coming up with a bookmark set of best places and having sort of an awards ceremony in the Rose Garden of the White House or some garden where we say librarians are pointing to where you can trust, what's the best quality, and do it like the science and humanity awards, but to do it as best bookmarks, that would be a wonderful leadership thing to do.

I think you're absolutely right about research. I was recently giving a Congressman whose district is right in the middle of the New York digital area, Congressman Nadler, kind of a tour of the companies in his district and what was going on down there. We were suggesting that every company that did things there also gave back to his local community. And he had a ton of questions, and I think we have to help educate Congress, because I think Congress really needs - I said to him, you need to rebrand.

I think Congress needs to do a learning journey where they go and find out what's really happening in real life with some of these issues out in their own communities.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Thank you.

José.

COMMISSIONER GRIFFITHS: I just wanted to follow up on what Joey had said. It seems to me that when most people think about this notion of validating what's out there on the web they get scared because they see how much is there. One of the things that I've always said about libraries, one of their roles, is the fact that they've always developed collections, but they were purposefully developed.

So the notion of validating the web doesn't necessarily mean looking at every single thing that's out there. It does mean identifying things that belong together and make sense and are appropriate.

But I just wanted to check whether you were talking about a sort of comprehensive sweep of everything that's out there or a slightly more proactive approach of saying, we're going to look for these kinds of things.

MS. RODGER: I think that's part of the development, but I think it is to bring the organization to the knowledge, but also to bring the validation. And it may mean -- I mean, what I'm after as an end product is for somebody in America to say, I want ear infections and Library of America sites, and know that when they do that search strategy they will get information about ear infections from good medical sites that will still be there, they won't be dead links, and that somebody there will have looked at the realm of medical science that deal with this and, say, consumer information, technical information, and will have sorted it out.

Then we've got a library on the web.. Until then we've got lists.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Abe.

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: I'd like to underscore the second point you made, which is the temporary issue of connectivity and training, because in less time than we'll probably imagine most of the classroom teachers shall have been people who probably trained somebody else to use the net before they went to college and became teachers.

Some of us recall that each little town in America had a Pac-Man parlor and then one Christmas for \$99 almost every family bought a Play Station and they disappeared. I'm imagining that -- well, I've just seen an ad, \$99 gets you the web and the e-mail on a phone line at home complete. That's a little bit less than a Play Station costs today, and even if you had an additional phone line that's less than most of the cable services.

So I think, although we're seeing a bulge right now, I think even public libraries in the mass will see less regular individual daily users than they have been now.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Denise.

MS. DAVIS: Just two comments with regard to the notion of librarians as clearinghouses for better sites. Not to invoke the SAILOR network again, but they just two weeks ago redid their web site, relaunched it, with the purpose of not doing exactly what Joey has asked to do, which is what they were founded on, but rather they've made the decision to only focus on Maryland information, which I think is an unfortunate turn of events. But for whatever reason, they've made this administrative decision.

The flip side that's good about that is that they're going to focus on Maryland information, so they have taken on the role of digitizing what is available in Maryland. So I think there's a good thing that's going to come out of that, but that's my bookmark. That's the place I go to because I know how it's structured and I can easily navigate the web.

I also go to places like Google and so on because I understand that the higher the points the better the site, although it's a mess.

The other thing I wanted to point out is that something's happened in libraries over the last few years that has pushed them to change, many of them, to change their notion of who they are. Baltimore County Public Library changed their Internet address away from a dot-lib to a dot-net, and they did that purposefully. So when people go off to look for them, I would look under a dot-lib. I would try and find it that way in a URL, and I can no longer -- I will no longer find Baltimore County Public Library that way because they have reassigned themselves. They have a new domain name.

So something is happening. They've become extremely entrepreneurial. They also have links on their site under their foundation that allows people to go to, online, to commerce sorts of places and that library gets a kickback every time you go to barnesandnoble.com or amazon.com or the local stereo store.

So they've taken that step. They have used the consumer model to draw attention back to their library. And they're not the only ones. But I think that we need to look at those libraries, public libraries, that have traditionally been on the leading edge of turning their libraries into bookstores and other things and talk to them about what they're doing and why, what was it strategically that made them make the decision to cross over that line, what is it that they're hearing from their customers that made them change the model of how they provide services.

I'm not sure exactly what kind of a form to put that in, but clearly there are plenty of library administrators out there that are very active in their communities and they feel this is the right way to go.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Joan.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: I'd like to say that what we're trying to get to grips with here is the fact that there's no peer review on any site. I want to put up a site tomorrow, I want to talk about brain surgery, you can do it. So what you're suggesting is an alternative system of peer review and that the libraries become the peer review system.

I'm not at all against that, because I think we have to have something eventually, some sort of system to understand what we have here. I think a lot of places are trying to cope with peer review. I just came from a conference at GW about this very question about scholarly journals. I'm not at all against that. I think that something has to come on. Otherwise it's like a bottle of milk thrown on a table is of no good to anybody. Somebody's got to put it in a bottle and then you can pour it out.

So I think it's an excellent suggestion.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Denise.

MS. DAVIS: I just have one other point and it's about where librarians go after they finish their graduate degree. Many of them are going to Internet service providers. They're going too AOL, they're going to Google. They are not going to libraries. I think that's something we have to

understand, especially in the Washington metropolitan area and in California, where we're losing very qualified librarians because the salaries are too low and they use their skills of "organizing information" and they're turning that over to corporations.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: We are getting close to when we really have to wind down because we have something very important going on at 5:30, and that is the first ever awards for the National Library Services.

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: Mine says 5:00 o'clock.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Oh, 5:00 o'clock. Well then, we really do have to wind down. Why did I think it was 5:30?

I've made some notes. First of all, the reason we invited everyone here today was to listen. If the Commission is going to be of any value to information literacy, to libraries of this nation, to the President and the White House and Congress, we first have to listen. It's sort of look before you leap.

So I really appreciate what everyone has said here today, and I made some notes on what I think are the most salient points: first of all, the confusion in the mission and the role of the major players, confusion between the role of the public library versus the school library, when are they together, when are they apart; and the need perhaps to redefine these roles.

Funding seems to be at the top of the list. If we don't have the funding to be able to look at some of these issues, they're not going to get looked at.

In terms of education, it's not only education of adults and children, but it's who teaches the teachers, the role of professional education in terms of librarians. We not only are looking at the librarians who are going to library schools that are morphing themselves into schools of information technology, but also the continuing education for librarians in the field who came into the profession before technology. I'm a perfect example of the computer klutz. So that's an issue.

Our being more proactive in terms of working with the President and the White House in terms of the importance of libraries, the role they are currently playing, which I think is somewhat transparent to everybody else.

Then the three issues that Joey brought up, which I think are substantial issues: the research, the training -- that may be very important now, but five years from now we will have other issues to deal with -- and content, the peer review, the evaluation.

I'm sorry. I am no longer a computer klutz. Now I need to learn how to digitally dance --

MR. WILLARD: No, digital dunce.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Oh, digital dunce. I'm now a digital dunce.

MR. WILLARD: That brings the term up to date.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: But I do have a hard time with computers.

We will be meeting and continuing to address some of these issues tomorrow. Again, I cannot thank you enough for giving us your time and I think some incredibly valuable input.

I haven't said much about where the Commission is going to go in whatever time I have to serve as the Chair, but before Jeanne died we talked a lot about where the Commission is going to go and the word that she kept on using was "proactive." We are not going to wait; we are going to move. But we cannot do it without a lot of input from the profession, not only the profession but also from the users.

So thank you. We are in recess until tomorrow.

(Whereupon, at 3:38 p.m., the meeting was recessed, to reconvene at 8:30 a.m. on Tuesday, April 11, 2000.)

**MEETING OF THE U.S. NATIONAL COMMISSION ON LIBRARIES
AND INFORMATION SCIENCE**

- -

Suite 820 1110 Vermont Avenue, N.W. Washington, D.C.

Tuesday, April 11, 2000

The meeting was convened, pursuant to recess, at 8:32 a.m., MARTHA B. GOULD, Chairperson, presiding.

COMMISSIONERS:

MARTHA B. GOULD, Chairperson
JOAN R. CHALLINOR, Vice Chair
C.E. "ABE" ABRAMSON
REBECCA T. BINGHAM
MARY S. FURLONG
JOSE-MARIE GRIFFITHS
JACK E. HIGHTOWER
ELIZABETH SYWETZ

STAFF:

ROBERT S. WILLARD, Executive Director
JUDITH C. RUSSELL, Deputy Director
ELIZABETH E. BINGHAM, Consultant
DENISE DAVIS
FOREST WOODY HORTON, Consultant
ROSALIE VLACH
BARBARA WHITELEATHER

GUESTS:

BOBBY ROBERTS, Commissioner designate
PAYTON NEAL, Software and Information Industry Association
EMILY SHEKETOFF, American Library Association
ANN MOLOD

PROCEEDINGS

ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: I'd like to bring the meeting to order, please.

CHAIRPERSON'S REPORT

The first item on the agenda are administrative matters, as I finish chewing my bagel. I don't have a great deal to report. I think everyone knows that tomorrow morning we do have a memorial service for Jeanne at the Library of Congress in the Coolidge Auditorium. There will be coffee and small little pastries at 8:30. At 9:30 the service starts and it should be over, I would imagine, by about 10:30.

I think everyone also knows that on the 3rd of March the President designated me as Chair and I immediately turned around and designated Joan Challinor as the Vice Chair.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: As her assistant.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: It's known as the tall and the short of it.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: Yes, I know, we make a great pair.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: It's just sort of continuing, we're going to be pretty much continuing on as the planning that was done when Jeanne was still with us.

I have with me this morning and I think you all have it at your place the submittal letter as well as our appropriations justification. I would suggest that you read through it. There is really nothing new. Again, it hits the highlights in terms of issues we've discussed in the past.

We also have, at long last, "The Kids and the Internet," the proceedings of our meeting. I would suggest that we will be sending this to the proper entities in the government and I think we should hand carry one to Senator McCain.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: Yes, but before you go on seamlessly I want to talk about that I think we should stop a moment to thank Martha for her service as Acting Chair. Nothing is more difficult than being an Acting Chair. Thank God I've never had to do that myself. But it is really, really difficult and I think we should all give a vote of thanks to Martha for a whole year as Acting Chair.

I know, Betsy, you people are now going to have an Acting Chair almost into the future. But I think we should give Martha a real vote of thanks for the job she did as Acting Chair for an entire year, and did it from Nevada, which is some state out there.

(Applause.)

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Thank you. I had a lot of help and a lot of support, and I was very lucky that up until just about ten days before she passed away Jeanne and I talked at least once and usually twice a week. And Bob, you also talked with her on a regular basis. So we kept Jeanne in the loop and in the planning.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: I also want to pay tribute to Bob and to Judy and to the staff for working with Acting everything and to keep things going here while we were kind of in a limbo there for a while. I don't think there's any other way to describe it. So we have come through a difficult time, and as long as Martha keeps her health we're going to be just fine.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: I'll be fine.

So basically my report is very simple: Everything is just going forth as has been planned in the past. There is nothing new except that I met this morning with several of the tribal librarians, who have some real concerns about the tribal money set-aside and the reauthorization of LSTA, and that's something that I think we have to really look at addressing fairly soon with ALA and with the Urban Library Council.

So with that, I'm going to turn it over for our Executive Director's report.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT

MR. WILLARD: This will look a little familiar to those of you who were in California, but not exactly.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: Excuse my neck.

MS. RUSSELL: Do you want to turn the lights down a bit, Barbara, behind the door.

(Slide.)

MR. WILLARD: Actually, why don't you give me the mouse. Eventually we'll have a portable mouse.

(Slide.)

I want to cover a number of points with you and I'll do it very briefly. Personnel -- well, I'll go through it each one at a time. But the most important personnel issue is just the tremendous loss we're all feeling by the absence of Jeanne. I hope you all had a chance to read the notes about the funeral service, and I think you could see that the community, that we were just one community that Jeanne was important to. I think, although the last six years of her life she devoted to this Commission, it was just amazing to see all the various people that turned out to honor her in Carbondale.

(Slide.)

Just a quick reminder. We've got some new staff members. I reported this last time, but I just want to repeat it: two replacements in La Keshia and Suzanne, who replace Charlene and Vivian; and Rosalie is filling a new spot and you'll hear a little bit more from her in this report because she's going to do something we haven't heard in a long time and that's give a legislative report.

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: And I met an intern yesterday, too.

MS. RUSSELL: Meagan Gabauer is a senior in high school here in Washington and has been doing some volunteer intern work for the Commission, helping with a number of things. She helped us with some of the final preparations for this meeting and for the memorial service, some several of our mailings, doing various things for us. She'll be around probably through this summer.

MR. WILLARD: In that regard, why don't you also mention --

MS. RUSSELL: Yes, we also have a consulting contract with Kathleen Lannon, what is helping us begin to put our records management into some kind of order. We're going to be 30 years old this summer and we have never officially transferred one sheet of paper to the Archives. So it's something I had identified when I first came and we just haven't gotten too it, and she's helping us take a look at where we stand right now with our records so we can develop a records schedule and we can set in process both staff training and some procedures so that we can identify things that we have been sitting on for all these years and we can go ahead and transfer, but also so that for the future we at least are proactive in identifying things that we need to hold onto and set aside for transfer, and particularly to try to set us up so that we capture electronic records as they're created and identify the ones that need to be retained for the Archives, because it's much harder to go back and look through, as we're doing now, the directory on the network and try the figure out which of those documents really matter than it is to identify them the day they're created and say, move this over into the folder that's called Archives and label it appropriately so we can figure out what we've got.

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: I don't know how sensitive she is about it, but La Keshia made a point of telling me there's a space between "La" and "Keshia".

MS. RUSSELL: There is, that's true.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: What did you say?

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: La Keshia made a point of telling me that there's a space between the "La" and the "Keshia".

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: And as I understand, it's "La Keshia," right?

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: Right, but there's a space.

MS. RUSSELL: It's "La Keshia," but she goes by "KEE-sha" as her nickname.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: "KEE-sha."

MS. RUSSELL: So if you say "La KEE- shee-a" then you need the "E" on it, but if you say "KEE-sha" you don't need it.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: It's the diminutive.

MS. RUSSELL: Yes, I guess.

MR. WILLARD: The other thing is, as you know, we are in a situation right now where there are five vacancies on the Commission, although one of those is Bobby Roberts and Bobby's appointment is before the full Senate right now, as is Joan's. But of course, Joan continues as an active member of the Commission until July 19th if the Senate doesn't take action.

We're hoping. I have no idea what's going on there in terms of why they are not processing nominations. They've gone a whole week. The executive calendar, which is where all the nominations are listed that are pending on the floor of the Senate, is extremely lengthy right now and I have a feeling it's essentially partisan politics. It has nothing to do with any of the individuals or any of the organizations that are being held up, but it's just the way the game is played right now.

You remember Walker Bass, who was the staff person that we dealt with at the White House Personnel Office. His replacement is Sue Greenberg, who came into the job directly from New Hampshire, where she had been working on the campaign. She has been around Washington a long time. I don't actually know her complete background, but I met with her two or three times on Commission vacancies and she is aggressively going after it.

We now have - White House Personnel puts together a list for the President to consider. The President then says yes or no. If the President says yes, then it goes out to where -- you remember the big package of paper you got. Well, we've got at least four people what are at that stage, who have the package of paper.

Now, of course, when that gets evaluated they then can become real nominees. So we're not at liberty to discuss names or anything like that. But I'm delighted that we are moving forward with some very impressive people to join the ranks of the Commission.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: Are you allowed to tell us who they are?

MR. WILLARD: No.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: No.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: Wait, wait. We've been talking to Sue Greenberg about them?

MR. WILLARD: Yes.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: But we're not allowed to say who they are?

MR. WILLARD: Right.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: It's privileged.

MR. WILLARD: It's a personnel matter. They may in fact not --

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: So it comes before the personnel committee?

MR. WILLARD: No, no. It comes before the President. But it may in fact, after the paperwork comes in, there may be an ethical question or there might be something that takes them out of consideration, so it's not a matter of record until that clearance process takes place.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: But we know who they are?

MR. WILLARD: Yes. Not all of we.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: Who knows who they are?

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: The "we" who know who they are are Bob and myself.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: Thank you. That's what I want to know.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: That is privileged information.

MR. WILLARD: Sue is going to try to get over here some time during the day today. I think it's important that she gets to know the Commission, just as Walker did. It's not definite that she'll be here, but I told her whenever it was convenient for her schedule to drop by and we would take the opportunity to meet her.

She will definitely be at the ceremony tomorrow. She knew Jeanne in another life.

In terms of appropriations, I've already told you we're operating at a \$1.3 million appropriation, a 30 percent increase over last year. As Martha pointed out, the submission is in front of you. Those of you who are careful about the paperwork you receive from the Commission probably received an earlier version which was our budget that we submitted to OMB. That is confidential information. You might as well get rid of it now. The document -- we asked, as everybody does, we asked for more money than OMB and the President approved.

So the amount of money that has been approved for us to ask of Congress is in round numbers is 1.5. It's actually 1.495060, but 1.5 million, which is a 15 percent increase. That document, both the cover letter and the full detailed information, is before you. I urge you too at least get familiar with the overall number and when you have opportunities to speak with anybody in Congress remind them that we're here and that we need their support.

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: Robert, who are the decisionmakers now on the committee that would approve that? Who are the key if you were to name three of the top decisionmakers?

MR. WILLARD: On the House side it's John Porter, who is the chairman of the subcommittee, and David Obey, who is chairman of both the full committee and the subcommittee that deals with Health, Education and Labor. He's from Wisconsin.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: I believe I have a meeting with the staff. Is it Wednesday or Thursday, Rosalie?

MS. VLACH: Thursday.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Thursday.

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: Could we get a copy of the full committee, just in case anything wavers and we need to know who's on it?

MR. WILLARD: Sure.

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: I'd prefer it be an e-mail --

MR. WILLARD: Actually, we'll do that during a break. We can get that for everybody.

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: With their e-mail addresses, if you have them.

MR. WILLARD: On the Senate side, the Senate subcommittee is led by Arlen Specter and Tom Harkin is the ranking minority member.

(Slide.)

Okay, publications. Well, it's finally here and I think you can say that it was a long time a-borning, but I think it's a good piece of work. One of the very first things we will do with it is make sure it gets into the hands of every member of Congress. Additional organizations or people that you think should receive it, just let me know and we will make sure it gets in their hands.

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: Could we talk about that for a minute, because I think we might be able to brainstorm off each other here. For example, industry leaders, I don't know if that's on your list. The media in key categories, is that on your list?

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Yes.

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: So does the media include Up Side and Red Herring and Business 2.0 and Fast Company? So where can Commissioners add value by contributing a letter or something to the dissemination of this? Or do you already have that under control?

MR. WILLARD: I'd say it's not completely under control. We certainly have a media list, but I know I'm familiar with some of the publications, but not all that you mentioned. Certainly we would welcome suggestions for particular publications that in any of the Commissioner's experience you think that they're not as visible or they're new and you think we ought to be aware of them.

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: Who's managing the communications plan?

MR. WILLARD: Rosalie.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Rosalie.

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: And is there a communications plan for the dissemination?

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Yes, there is.

MR. WILLARD: It's developing, yes.

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: Okay, so can you send a copy of that. So then we could take a look at that and look at your list and then add to the list.

MR. WILLARD: Okay.

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: And will you be the primary spokesperson, Martha or Bob, like if someone wanted to interview you about this report?

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: I would be the primary spokesperson.

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: Okay. I think it's really important that your bio and your history --

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: You mean my 20 years as a children's library specialist?

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: Let me just say that reports like this can easily fall on somebody's desk along with other books and other resources, and if we really want awareness about this we're going to have to do a little bit of focused energy to get it in the hands of the right tech reporters at USA Today saying, there's a report here, here's this person.

Because you open it up and the first thing you notice is that it's a wonderful introduction by Jeanne, but we're not going to be able to interview Jeanne on this topic.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: That is correct.

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: So we need to know who would I talk to about this and that doesn't pop right out from this. I think in the communications plan, if you're going to invest this

amount of energy into this, which I'm sure is a very strong and credible report, you want to invest 20 percent energy into the dissemination in the right places.

I have just seen so much traction with issues on topics that a lot doesn't get done in terms of mind share, and if you can focus more on the communications plan I think in the long run you'll be happy about the result.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Well, Rosalie is on board now and we are moving ahead with this. I would definitely suggest that everyone here think about dissemination points that you yourselves may have access to. Work with Rosalie and Rosalie of course will work with all of the Commissioners.

I think it would be a very good idea if we have entities that we want to make sure receive the report that as Commissioners you can certainly send the report with a note, but it's got to be coordinated through Rosalie.

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: Fine. I guess I would suggest that if you look at the events that are going to happen in the next year where Bob or you or members of the Commission might be speaking, you don't want to just send a report. You want to be able to say: The results from this are going to be presented at this conference by this person.

So the reason I was pushing harder on the communications plan is I think it's a combination of pretty focused energy in terms of the touchstone points where you can make the most difference. It may be a case where you can get someone from Steve Case's office, if they endorse the findings, to also help buoy some of the communication and dissemination.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: The other thing, too, is we have to coordinate with ALA. They have to know what we're doing.

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: Fine. But you know, it seems to me that's a great opportunity for you to say at the next three conferences you're going to be offering information and condensed versions. So I would want to see in the communications report an outline of the speaking engagements attached to this for you.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: It will happen, and we thank you.

MR. WILLARD: You also have in your folder the NTIS report. I'm not going to say much about that because it's an agenda item for later today.

The disability hearing will follow the same model as the Kids and the Internet. That's I guess one of two next publications that are in the pipeline, the other one being the annual report. So we still have a lot of work to be done in the publications area, but we're moving along.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: Bob, I have a question. Is the disability hearing a summary or is it the actual transcript?

MR. WILLARD: The actual transcript.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Proceedings.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: How do we choose between an actual transcript and a summary of it? How do we make the determination?

MR. WILLARD: Well, obviously the summary would be a harder thing to do because we'd have to write the summary. So we don't have the bandwidth to handle that right now, so the easier thing to do is to put out the full report.

MS. RUSSELL: Typically for a hearing you would put out a transcript, as distinct from some other type of meeting, where you might simply summarize it. That's the sort of traditional thing with a hearing.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Yes, because the transcript actually reports the proceedings and that's what we're publishing. It will have an introduction.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: Well, in the case of the "Kids and the Internet" we had both. We now have a transcript and we have a pamphlet which we could then send out.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Yes, but the pamphlet was really, the pamphlet did not summarize the hearing. What we did is we knew we had to move very quickly, so we designed a pamphlet. If you remember, there was myself and Nancy Davenport and you, and whom else -- Rebecca -- that sort of had made notes and listened, and we pulled together the pamphlet, the brochure, which turned out to be very valuable.

But the publication we have here actually represents the entire proceedings.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: I understand that. But I just say, I wonder if we couldn't have a pamphlet on the disabilities, because I think the other one worked so well. I think the system worked so well that we have a short one to go out and let everybody know and then we have the transcripts months later.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Let's talk about that when we do our strategic planning.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: Fine.

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: I have another suggestion related to this. It seems to me the Commission can -- is in fact doing work on the digital divide from this report, from the disability, and I would suggest that you add, consider adding a hearing on older adults and the Internet and having some kind of report that documents what they're going to be doing online.

A venue for that could be a conference in the spring where they're bringing 400 older adults together. And I think Horace Deets is all over this issue, who commands a lot of throw weight here legislatively, and I think he's very interested in this topic, as is John Rather of AARP.

I think it's really important to in a sense fill out the hand of the other constituent populations. So to the extent that you could do that, I think that's an idea.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Let's bring that up in our strategic planning. Before I forget, and this is my fault and I apologize, please identify yourself.

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: He said yesterday that's no longer necessary. He has the seating chart and he knows what we all are.

MS. RUSSELL: He's identifying us into the record as we speak.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Okay, fine.

Thank you, Mary. Okay, Bob.

(Slide.)

MR. WILLARD: Let me quickly hit the projects that I worry about day in and day out. The ones that have asterisks after them, I'm not going to say much about them because we've actually got agenda items later in the day.

I do want to mention just briefly that, as a result of a meeting with Marilyn Mason and Richard Ackroyd that took place in San Antonio, we are looking at putting a proposal -- we've got a sort of a mini-proposal in front of the Gates Foundation to do some focus group work on perspectives of where libraries will be in the future.

We're using Marilyn Mason as a consultant who has helped us put together the proposal and Richard has it on his desk. He's only had it a few weeks and we know that things happen slowly in terms of decisionmaking there, so I'm not disappointed that we haven't heard yet. But I think if they are willing the fund this -- and we're asking for approximately \$150,000 to do it - I think it'll be one more very important contribution in the digital divide concept and many other sort of public perception of what libraries are all about in the future, which will help inform the policymaking and policy advising function of the Commission.

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: May I suggest that you also consider as a backup submitting it to the Markell Foundation, where Zoe Baird is now interested in topics like this and has hired many people from Benton; and as a backup to that, a colleague of the Commission, Diane Frankel, is now Program Officer at the Irvine Foundation and she may be friendly to this kind of thing as well. So you may be able to expand upon that or have those as backups.

MR. WILLARD: That's a good idea.

(Slide.)

I won't say anything more about NTIS because that's a big report this afternoon, as is the White House conference. Strategic planning is next on our agenda.

The international activities. We are in the midst of our annual discussion with the Department of State on funding international library and information science activities. There's a strong push to be much more tightly aligned with UNESCO and I don't think I need to say more about that right now, but just be assured that we are moving it along. And I want to publicly recognize Woody Horton, who, in addition to doing all sorts of good work on the NTIS function, also represents us quite well in dealing with State Department personnel.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: Bob, I'd like to say something about Woody's work in briefing the head of the International Committee. He briefs me from time to time about things I have no idea on and he is a wonderful briefer. I want to say thank you, Woody, for all the time you give me because it's above and beyond the call of duty.

MR. WILLARD: Just quickly let me talk about some of the meetings and events that have taken place since we last were together in February in Los Angeles. Joan and I had an opportunity to meet with the Director, the Associate Director of UNESCO, who focuses on communication and information activities, and a member of his staff..

We also in that same trip -- and I didn't make a bullet point for it, but the other visit we made while we were in Paris was to the wife of the American ambassador, who used to be the chairman of the board of the New York Public Library. So she has a very strong interest in libraries. She has already initiated a program of pairing senior museum directors, the directors of about seven museums throughout France, with directors of seven museums in the United States.

This had never happened before and both sides were sort of skeptical about whether there'd be any value from it. After the first meeting they saw the value of it immediately and they are picking up the telephone and having a trans-Atlantic conversation. We began the conversation of saying a similar sort of thing ought to exist for libraries, so it's on the agenda.

(Slide.)

Digital archiving grew out of Martha's presentation down at the Center for Research Libraries last fall. We had a brief meeting where we met with the Center for Research Libraries, the Council for Library and Information Resource, the Digital Library Foundation -- Federation, and Martha participated from Reno by phone.

MS. BINGHAM: As did Jose-Marie, by phone.

MR. WILLARD: Yes. It's an extremely interesting topic and it's one that when I was first appointed to the Commission I said something that I was very concerned about, and that is where are the records that are created today digitally going to end up, how can we be assured of long-term access.

Intellectual property legislation or policy impinges on this, although it was clear from our discussion that if you do a sort of a razor-sharp distinction between preservation of information for long-term archiving versus having the digital information available for research and current use, that you can engage publishers in a conversation where they aren't overly concerned about the copyright issues. If they just know that you're trying to put it away until long after the copyright is no longer an issue, they're not involved -- do you think we blew a fuse?

MS. RUSSELL: No, I think I hit the switch down here by my foot.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: I thought we were through.

MR. WILLARD: And then I'll have to do it from memory. What's my next point?

(Slide.)

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Well, a perfect example of what happens when the power goes out at Reagan International Airport last night.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: What happened?

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: They lost all power at the airport, everybody, and both backups also failed.

MR. WILLARD: I also went to the FSCS conference, which I hope Denise may say a little bit about in her report on statistics.

(Slide.)

Joan and I were delighted to have an opportunity to attend the dedication ceremony for the new Department of Labor Library. It was named in honor of a Cabinet Secretary who was appointed to the Cabinet when I was still a undergraduate at Georgetown, Willard Wirtz, and whose actual full name is W. Willard Wirtz. I don't know what the "W" stands for, but he was claiming to be or I guess someone introduced him to be the original WWW.

By the way, the Secretary of Labor not only gave a very stirring talk about the importance of libraries, when other people were talking about the library you could see her sitting there nodding in agreement when people were talking about the value.

COMMISSIONER GRIFFITHS: I have to make a comment. I'm glad they've seen the light, because I remember in the early to mid-1980's doing a study for the Department of Labor on why they should keep their libraries open and not close them or outsource them, as they were talking about doing. So I'm glad it's there and rededicated.

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: That was part of the Reaganomics, was it?

MR. WILLARD: I did go to the annual event, Friends of the Law Library of Congress, where Chuck Ruff, the counsel to the President, was honored. And we have a continuing representation at a meeting that the GPO is convening about quarterly on some of the issues about permanent public access to digital information as it pertains to federal information. Of course, this impinges very much on the GPO study, which we have sort of held in abeyance as we focus on NTIS, but we certainly have not lost sight of.

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: It's really part of the same thing, though. It doesn't merely open the door -- it's more than a foot in the door. It really opens the door.

(Slide.)

MR. WILLARD: I'll just do this quickly, presentations I've done. I spoke before the British Library and Information Commission on U.S. information policy.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: And we're getting a copy of your speech?

MR. WILLARD: It's on the web.

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: I've got a question about the British Library and Information Commission. That's a newly formed entity?

MR. WILLARD: No, it's a newly dead entity. On April 1st it was replaced by the Museum Library and Archives Council.

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: That's the network thing?

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: The new acronym is "MLAC," and somebody said it sounded more like a milk than like a commission.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Yes, baby formula.

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: Or infant medicine.

MR. WILLARD: They had about 150 people turn out. Joan also was there. I was part of a panel that talked about sort of context setting, so I talked about the U.S. experience in information policy. There was a Scandinavian --

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: Yes, the head of the National Library of Norway.

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: What interests me about it is that the Gates Foundation made a direct grant to the new entity, as I understand it.

MR. WILLARD: Well, actually to the old entity, but everything that the old entity had gets transferred to the new entity.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: You should have my notes on that trip.

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: I did and that's why I'm asking, because it seemed a little unusual, based on the experience of the Gates Foundation here. Did they just feel that that was the most direct way to do there what they're doing here?

MR. WILLARD: I can't speak to them, but my guess is that it was simply a bandwidth issue, that they gave it to them and let them handle it. I mean, it wasn't very much comparatively.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: No, but I take your meaning.

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: Since we have a proposal in front of them.

MR. WILLARD: Yes.

The other thing is I spoke at the Florida Library Day, which is their equivalent of Legislative Day here at the federal level. They had, oh, I would say 350 librarians and trustees assembled. I spoke at the dinner on the night before and the following day they were going to tackle the Florida legislature.

Yesterday I spoke to the community colleges, and that's the end of my presentation, but as always I welcome any questions. I do want to turn over the mike for just a minute to Rosalie Vlach, who will give us a little status report on legislation.

MS. VLACH: How about if I just pull the chair here. Would you mind if I just pull the chair here?

What I'm going to give you this morning is just a very quick summary of some of the bills that I feel that you might be interested in.

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: Is that switch on?

MS. VLACH: I think so. The red light -- oh, I thought it was on. Now it is on.

This will be a quick summary because I do have copies of these bills. If you're interested in more detail, I'd be happy to give it to you offline. What I've done is I've categorized these into three separate categories. One is just general things that I think would be of interest, and surely if you have anything that you would like me to latch onto I would be doing that.

Then I have the Internet, Kids on the Internet category, and a digital divide category. What I will do is I'll just give you a little summary, and if you have further questions, as you can see from my pile, I do have the bills here and we can go into detail.

The first is S. 2, which is a Senate bill called the Educational Opportunities Act, and that is a reauthorization the extend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. The sponsor

of the bill is Senator Jeffords and there are, oh, about six or seven others. Again, if you're interested in more detail I have it here.

It was introduced in January of 1999 and it was referred to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions. The acronym is "HELP," so when I see that I think, wait a minute, are they really that bad off?

The purpose is to establish a goal to have all students computer literate by the time they leave the eighth grade, and it allows schools to use Title I money if at least 40 percent of the students, the student population, is considered economically disadvantaged.

There has been an increase in activity since early March. There have been three markup sessions on this.

Another bill --

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: I want to ask something. If we want everybody to be computer literate by the eighth grade, what happened to the program about everybody should be able to read by the third grade?

MS. VLACH: Well, that, quite frankly I haven't seen that much legislation about that. They're so concerned about computer literacy.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: No, but you can't be computer literate if you can't read.

MS. VLACH: No, I agree. I understand that, because as we said yesterday this is the sexy thing and that's where all of the attention seems to be.

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: Some people think you can teach reading on the computer.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: Well, I was part of a group in 1971 that got ten free computers and sent them to Lorton so that the men in prison -- our idea was that if you were put away for six years, you have six years in which to learn to read and that these men would not admit that they couldn't read because they were so ashamed, but they would admit that they didn't know how to use a computer.

We were enormously proud of ourselves, so I'm going to tell you what happened. The computers arrived at Lorton and were put in a closet. About three months later I went out there myself to see the men working on the computers and was told: What computers? So I went around, and I'll give you the short form: The computers were finally taken out of the closet and put on desks, and a black market arrived in which the men were trading, instead of cigarettes, time on the computers, they liked them so much. If you do this for me I'll give you an hour on my computer. They used to trade cigarettes.

And six months later not a single computer worked and they were all put away and never brought out again ever.

MS. VLACH: Well, as a D.C. native I think that you're discussing something that we all know is part of the problem with the District of Columbia. That's another issue.

MR. WILLARD: I would ask that we keep our comments until Rosalie has finished with running through all the bills, and perhaps we can discuss some of the policy issues during our strategic planning session.

MS. VLACH: Another bill, which is S. 1262, which is the Elementary and Secondary School Library and Media Resources Training and Advanced Technology Act, and the purpose of that is to amend the ESEA, which is the acronym for the one about which I previously spoke. It's to provide up to date library and media resources and well-trained, professionally certified school library and media specialists for elementary schools and secondary schools and for other purposes.

The sponsor for that is Senator Reid and again a host of other co-sponsors. It was introduced in June of '99, it was referred to the Committee, HELP. I understand that it will be offered as an amendment to S. 2 by the end of April, which perhaps then it will get some attention.

H.R. 3003 is of the same title, has the same purpose. It was sponsored by Major Owens in the House on 10-4-99 and again it was referred to the House Committee on Education and Workforce.

There is one other, which is the Andrew Carnegie Libraries for Lifelong Learning Act. It is to provide public library construction and technology enhancement, which was introduced in the middle of June of this year. It was again referred to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions on the same day, after having been read twice.

There is a House bill which is exactly the same, sponsored by Hinkley, and it was introduced in November.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Rosalie, what is the bill --

MS. VLACH: The numbers?

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Yes.

MS. VLACH: The number for the Andrew Carnegie is 1223, S. 1223, and the House bill is 3391.

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: Why is it called "Andrew Carnegie"? I mean, is it specifically for Andrew Carnegie libraries?

MS. VLACH: No, no. There is an act, an earlier act.

The digital divide is the next category that I have been looking at. There is something called the Digital Empowerment Act, which is H.R. 3897. There is a comparable bill in the Senate called - it is number 2229, that was introduced by Mikulski just this past March, March 9th. The House bill was introduced in March also.

This one has been getting a great deal of attention. It has been referred to a slew of committees. One was the Committee on Education and Workforce, on the 9th; Commerce on the 9th; Subcommittee on Telecommunications, Trade, and Consumer Protection on the 9th; the Subcommittee on Housing and Community Opportunity and the Ways and Means Committee. All of those - - excuse me. The Housing and Community Opportunity, it was just sent to them on the 31st of March.

I have made a list of some of the titles just to give you some idea of the reach of it. Title I is "One-Stop Shop for Technology Education," Title II is "Digital Education," Title III is "Expansion of Universal Service Assistance." That includes libraries. It's education, really, to get the equipment in there.

Title IV is "E-Corps Programs," Title V is "Community Technology Centers," and again in that title libraries are specifically included. Title VI is "Neighborhood Networks for Public Housing" and Title VII is "Incentives for Technology Assistance."

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: Has this cooled off or are we going to use it again?

MR. WILLARD: We're going to use it again in ten minutes.

MS. VLACH: H.R. 4061 is called the Digital Divide Elimination Act of 2000 and it is to amend the Internal Revenue Code to extend the enhanced deduction for charitable contribution of computers to provide better public access to computers. So in other words, they're trying to encourage companies to donate computers and they get a better tax writeoff.

That was introduced by Congressman Jeffers, and again many, many -- let's put it this way. The co-sponsors are two lines long and I've only listed their last names. So if you're interested I can give you that as well. That was also introduced this month.

MR. WILLARD: The report that you've typed up, I want to get copies for everybody.

MS. VLACH: Okay, that's great.

That was introduced on the 22nd of March and it was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.?

The Digital Empowerment Act in the Senate I already talked to you about. It was the same, with all of those various titles.

Kids on the Internet: S. 2061, Kids 2000 Act, which is to establish crime prevention and computer education initiatives. It was introduced by Senator Biden and co-sponsored by Senator Specter. It was introduced in February and it was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

You will notice that a lot of these, there hasn't been a great deal of activity. The gist of it -- and I have a copy of it here -- is school technology grants for Boys and Girls Clubs. I mean, it was very specific. So I don't know how we can help with that.

The S. 97, Children's Internet Protection Act, is to require the installation and use by school and libraries of a technology for filtering or blocking material on the Internet on computers with Internet access to be eligible to receive or retain universal service assistance. I think most of you know that as the bill that Senator McCain introduced, and that was introduced in January. It was referred to the Committee on Science and Transportation in August --

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: Would it be worthwhile to send our "Kids and the Internet" to everybody concerned with that?

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Actually, we have every intention of doing that, and I think probably I'm going to be meeting, I think, with the staff in Bryan's office. Bryan, who is the junior Senator from Nevada and a friend, is on that committee.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: Is there going to be a hearing?

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: I don't know that.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: Can we offer -- if there was a hearing, wouldn't it be appropriate --

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: It would be very appropriate. It's one of the things I'm going to discuss with Bryan's office that when there is a hearing we have a chance to provide both written and verbal or oral testimony.

MS. VLACH: There is a related House bill, 543. I don't know why I don't have the sponsor of that.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Is that the Istruk bill?

MS. VLACH: I think so.

There's one other issue that I know the ALA is concerned with and they have responded in writing to this. There was a notice in the Federal Register by the Copyright Office of the Library of Congress called the Digital Millennium Copyright Act of 1998, which was signed into law on October 28, 1998.

There was a request for comments and the ALA's comments were specifically requesting that library use be exempt from this particular act.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: What's the status at this point?

MS. VLACH: Right now they have extended the deadline date. I believe it's tomorrow, and then they will have a series of hearings. If you want those dates I can get them for you.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: And again, we might want to talk with Emily, because I think there are some policy issues here.

MR. WILLARD: Well, clearly there are policy issues, but it's intellectual property.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: I know it's intellectual property and we're not doing a lot with intellectual property right now because we don't have the resources. But I think if we talk with Emily and the Washington office we may be able to at least provide some written backup and comments from the policy point of view.

It's something I think we ought to at least look into.

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: Weren't there two bills? Is this the bill we liked and then there's the bill we didn't like?

MR. WILLARD: Are you thinking about database protection?

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: Isn't this cranked into that a little bit?

MR. WILLARD: No. The Digital Millennium Copyright Act, the hottest issue right now is anti-circumvention prohibitions, which means that if technological protection on access is in place it is a criminal offense to undo that protection. So how does the concept of fair use fit into that?

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: Right.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: I was at a meeting at GW, a symposium, two weeks ago and a woman from ALA, the legal counsel, spoke and said that was the most important bill up this year, the Digital Millennium Copyright Act.

MS. VLACH: I think that's also why they had to extend the deadline for comments, because they do realize that it is.

Well, that's all I have for now. If there's anything you want me to track, just let me know and I'll be happy to do it.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Just at this point would you make copies of your report to hand out to all of us.

MS. VLACH: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: And then later on this week You, Bob, and I have to sit down and look at when the hearings are going to be. And not necessarily will I be the person who will be testifying. I'm looking at other Commissioners to involve you in testifying if necessary verbally and orally on bills. So we'll take it from there.

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: Verbally and in writing?

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Verbally and in writing. What did I say?

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: Verbally and orally.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: There's nothing wrong with me, nothing wrong with me.

MR. WILLARD: Let me conclude by saying that one of the things that disappointed me greatly, it's now, believe it or not, over two years since -- I started out as Acting Director and then I guess it was two years ago this month that the Commission voted to offer me the position of permanent Executive Director, at least full-time Executive Director.

It had bothered me immensely that one of the things just decided early on we could not do was do the legislature report that Jane Williams had been doing so masterfully for years. I'm glad we're taking the first step to get back into that area.

One of the other things that is on the short to-do list and probably will be focused on this summer is a great improvement in our web site. One of the things I want to do there is make the legislative report much more functional so that you can not only read what the bills are, but they'll also be linked so you can get copies of them, you can see related position papers from other organizations. That's the beauty of the web in terms of linking to other things and we're not taking advantage of it, but we will.

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: Did we just take care of the agenda item, the 2:00 p.m. item on legislative update?

MR. WILLARD: Yes. I guess I did it out of order.

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: Bob, on your web site strategy, can I suggest that it be not only a web site strategy, but an overall digital strategy for communication? I think it might be more impactful or easier for the Commissioners to employ the use of postcards or listserv type e-mails on things that --

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: We can't hear you.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: You have to talk into the microphone.

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: Bob, I think that your communications strategy on the Internet should include things that would be easy for the Commissioners to send to other people via e-mail. What I find is that people do not want to go to look at a lot of URL's every day and that it

would be really helpful for us to say: Here is kind of an FYI inside scoop on the Commission and here are things that we'd like you to make other people aware of that are issues or findings that we have.

So Martha's talking about "Kids and the Internet" at this conference; let us do targeted e-mails around that kind of thing. So that one part of it seems to be redoing the web site, but a deeper part I think is to use the communication power of the Internet for us to disseminate more information about what the Commission is doing, so that we could then say to the people we know in Congress: Here are things that you should be aware of.

So as you revise your strategy, my suggestion is you look at e-mail distribution in a deeper way.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: At 9:30 we're supposed to have a 15-minute break, but we still have the meeting calendar, the dates, and the approval of the minutes. Would you like to get those taken care of? Okay, so we'll just do the meeting calendar. We'll just do the meeting calendar and those dates after the break, or do you want to get it out of the way now?

(No response.)

Well, don't everybody speak at once.

NCLIS MEETING CALENDAR

Well, if nobody says anything we're going to continue and we'll look at the meeting calendar, and then we'll take a break.

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: We're talking about this (indicating)?

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Yes. Actually, what I would sort of like you to do is to go over the notes, get the notes, please, to Judy so that Bob and Judy and I can sit down and figure out what kind of money we have and who can go where and how we can find the money to reimburse you. Is that a good way of putting it?

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: We're not going to meet on Thursday of this week, right?

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: No, no.

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: It shows us meeting on Thursday, Friday, and Saturday.

MS. RUSSELL: Some of these were tentative things that we have taken off. We were holding the time until we knew what day the awards were.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Right. But I think what we are most interested in are state meetings, national conventions, things like that. So just go ahead and look at it and feed the information back to Judy.

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: We don't want to talk about any of them now? We do or we don't?

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: No, no.

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: I'm just, I'm noticing on Library Legislative Day nobody's plugged in there. I can't make it.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: I will be here. I will be here for Legislative Day.

MS. RUSSELL: May 1st.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: I'll be here May 1st and May 2nd. I'll be in the office May 3rd until the afternoon and then I fly back that afternoon.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: I think I'm here.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: You're there, too?

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: Yes, I think I'm there, too.

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: Good.

MR. WILLARD: Let me just say in general that when it comes to Legislative Day that any Commissioners that are involved in that generally are doing it on their own.

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Bob is going to be attending the Medical Library Association meeting.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: Is Caroline giving a paper?

MR. WILLARD: No.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: What about those dates, Bob?

MR. WILLARD: One of the things that I would like the Commission to consider is not really a hiatus, but it's hard to schedule Commission meetings when we have so few Commissioners, so I am hoping -- and when you meet Sue Greenberg you will see that she's very aggressive about this, and I think we will see nominations made within the next couple of months. Whether or not

they will become appointments depends on the activity of the Senate, so that's a heavy political question.

But it may make sense for the Commission to rely primarily on Executive Committee action until we are up to fuller strength. But in the mean time, this would be an appropriate time to suggest any significant events that the Commission might want to have a meeting in conjunction with.

For example, we do have an open invitation to hold a meeting in Nebraska in October or November when there are about two or three different groups coming together -- COSLA, the State Library Association, and I think there was one other. S they've suggested that would be a good time for the Commission to hold a meeting.

If there are other things like that that you're aware of, we could get that on the record.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Yes, Mary.

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: I'd like to suggest that the Commission hold a meeting in conjunction with one of the national aging associations, either National Council on Aging, American Society on Aging, possibly AARP, and during that time assess where and how older people are using the Internet.

MS. RUSSELL: Do we know when the Museum Services Board joint meeting will be? Somebody said something about early September.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: We don't know yet.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: Because it hasn't been set?

COMMISSIONER SYWETZ: I think that's true.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: It hasn't been set. And remember, we also have to work around the high holy days.

MS. RUSSELL: Yes, and the end of the fiscal year.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Yes. And I'm very anxious to hold, I don't know if it would be a hearing or a forum, around the issue of the status of school libraries in the United States, which are absolutely poverty-stricken. Is that a good way of putting it? I would very much like too hold the meeting in Cincinnati, at the Cincinnati Hamilton County Library, and for a very specific reason. That is, when I visited the library in Cincinnati a few months ago -- the funding in Cincinnati is statewide, so local entities don't fund their public libraries. There is a statewide formula for the funding of public libraries in the state of Ohio.

However, nothing is done to fund school libraries and now that the public libraries have stable funding what's happening is that the schools are turning to the public libraries to pick up the

slack and that's causing some very interesting problems, and I thought that would be a good way of highlighting because it goes to, I think, one of the basic problems and that's how not only we fund public libraries, but how we fund school libraries.

So some time in this next fiscal year I really would like to see us address the role. School libraries I think have been neglected abysmally by the American Library Association. The emphasis always seems to be on public libraries and public libraries pick up the slack, which causes other problems.

Abe?

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: If the elections go the way I hope in Montana, our new superintendent of public education will be a school librarian and would be the kind of person -- she's presently a state legislator in Montana -- would be the kind of person that would add some interesting and forceful perspectives to that kind of a hearing.

So if we did the after November, I hope that she would be available on that capacity.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: Are you suggesting Montana in the winter?

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: No, no, no. She could find Cincinnati.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: I'm suggesting Cincinnati. It is a hub, so it's easy to fly into Cincinnati.

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: And my birthplace.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: What can I say.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: Tangentially, the airport in Cincinnati has one of the best bookstores in any airport.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: And it's in Kentucky.

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: It's not in Ohio, right.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: And we've not had a meeting in the heartland. So I think it would be good.

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: Kansas City.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Well, yes, but that was a couple of years ago.

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: Martha, what are the plans to -- I mean, I think you've done a brilliant job here of articulating the need and finding events to probe that deeper. What are the plans to discern where the funding is coming from around the digital divide? So people like

Carly Fiorina, who is the CEO of HP, has been quite articulate on these issues. What on the Commission team is going to probe how their supporting that with dollars? Who's going to sort of link up the funding side, because there's a lot of pots of gold that are going to go in places and I think it's important.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Strategic planning, which we will come to after the break.

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: But I think it should be tied in with events. So if we're talking about the calendar, it's a little hard to discern where we're going to go without knowing the plan, because if the plan is partially to tap into the funding sources you're not going to find those people at certain conferences. You have to kind of go where they are.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: You're right, that is correct.

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: So we need to be able to say you or Bob or Jose or someone from the Commission is going to go to the Red Herring conference and hold a hearing to find out what Carly is doing, what John Doerr is doing, what these other six people are doing, to bridge the digital divide and where that money is going. Is it going to schools, which I think it's 90 percent going to elementary schools. Maybe 10 percent could go to school libraries

So just by bridging that gap -- but that's going the take going where they are, because they don't travel well.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: I think it's a good point.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Okay, all right. We will break until 10:00 o'clock. Be back here at 10:00. Synchronize your watches.

(Recess.)

(Slide.)

MR. WILLARD: During the break you should have received a copy of the slides that we're using. There was a question during the break unrelated too the strategic planning, but for those of you that don't know the plan we have for the space we are in, let me just quickly let you know that we are in negotiations with GSA and the landlord of this building to take over some space in this suite, including the conference room we are in and the reception area and offices along the front of the building and to give up a like or almost a like amount of space in the back of our suite.

This will allow us to have a much more pleasant entryway for people coming to visit the Commission. It will also, when we take out this wall (indicating), it will allow this conference room to be big enough for a full Commission meeting with observers. So whenever we're in Washington, until we get to the point where we have standing room only of observers, we can hold our meetings right in our office.

I would like to tell you when that will all happen, but we're dealing with GSA.

STRATEGIC PLANNING FOR THE COMMISSION

What's next in our agenda is a continuation of activity that began with the Executive Committee in New Orleans last summer when the ALA meeting was held there. It was followed up by some additional activities, I guess.

MS. RUSSELL: San Antonio.

MR. WILLARD: Well, San Antonio, right. And then there was a presentation of the PowerPoint slides that you're going to see today with only slight modifications at our meeting in Los Angeles. But the purpose of that was simply to let you know that it was coming up and it was basically a principal agenda item for today.

The last time the committee met to discuss strategic planning was the meeting in Little Rock in, I guess, the beginning of '98, and it is that action plan that was adopted there that has generally guided our activities. But we have varied from it a great deal.

The plan approach that the staff has suggested, is suggesting through today's program, is a different idea than what the action plan was that we adopted in Little Rock that basically de novo created three principal action areas. My approach was to say it isn't up to the Commission to choose the overarching structure of the plan. Rather, that has been assigned to us by law. Instead, what we need to do is look at the structure that the law provides us and within that say -- and within that and within the resource constraints of a fixed budget, what are the things we can do to deliver on the objectives that we have been assigned by law.

(Slide.)

Traditionally strategic plans, they'll vary from organization to organization, but there's a sort of a vision statement that sets an overall goal, there's a mission statement that says why this organization exists and what it is to do, what are the goals that support that mission statement, and under that the specific actions. And of course, you need to measure how you're doing on your actions, so you need to be sensitive to -- you don't plan the outcomes. You know what they should be, but then as you move forward you look at the outcomes and say, did this do what we wanted it to do in terms of the goals.

(Slide.)

I contend that the statute itself -- and that's the reason you have your annual report. If you turn to page A-1, which comes right after page 60, you'll have a copy of the statute for reference, and I'll refer to that a little bit more as we go on.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: I got one.

MR. WILLARD: So what you'll see in the beginning of our law is a vision statement. It still astounds me that this vision statement was written 30 years ago, 30-plus years ago, and was adopted in July of 1970, because, as I've said many times in many presentations, this was before 500-channel cable TV, this was before the PC, this was before the Internet.

It was at a time when online computing was just beginning to emerge. It was a time when a room this big would fit a computer that has less processing power than the first Atari game set I had.

Yet the Congress, not only in their statement, but also in their discussion of the statute on the floor of the House and the Senate, recognized how important information was to everything else the government does and that in order to optimize it, in order to optimize the investment that this nation will make in information, it would be good to have a permanent advisory body to help understand the issues.

So the vision is in the law.

(Slide.)

Then the mission statement, and that's pretty straightforward.

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: Apparently the vision of the Congress was superior to that of the person who signed the bill. I keep hearing about some comments that were recorded at the time of the signing of the bill, but I've never seen them.

MR. WILLARD: Let me say two things to that. Substantively, I'll get back to that. Secondly, that's exactly how this meeting should work. This is not a presentation by me. This is a conversation by the whole Commission. So whenever a point comes up, don't think about it and say, I'll get to it later. Raise it right then and there.

You're exactly right. Richard Nixon signed the bill and published a statement on why he was opposed to having a Commission, but the reason he was opposed to having a Commission had nothing to do with its mission. He was for having it as an entity within the Department of HEW at the time. That was the principal debate that took place within the Congress, was whether it would be an independent Commission inside HEW, and there was debate about how the Commission would issue reports and the Secretary of HEW could not alter them.

But finally the political compromise when it was in conference was that it would be an independent committee -- Commission. Nixon, however, went back and said, I still don't think there's a need for another government entity.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: One of the things that I feel very strongly about, we look at both the mission statement and go back to the actual law, which is I think really our vision statement, is that we have not been proactive enough. It seems to me that we're always running behind and we now are at a point where I think we can be very proactive.

A perfect example would be taking the proceedings of "Kids and the Internet" and getting it into the hands of key people in the Congress that are dealing with that legislation to say, hey, wait a minute, you know, etcetera, etcetera. So that really is something I would like to see us grab a hold of and really start moving in that direction. I just feel very, very strongly -- and it has taken us a while to build up the strength, to get a decent budget, and now I think we're ready to move from walking to running.

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: Martha, I think you're absolutely right and I think this gives you --

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: Is your microphone on?

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: Yes, it is.

Martha, I think you're absolutely right to do that, and I think that that should be a very focused effort. Since my field is computers and older adults, I think there's a challenge you face in doing that. That is you have to deal with the information literacy of the Congress, and I think --

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: That was worth coming down just to hear.

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: With all due respect, we cannot be in a position any more to have -- it would be remiss for me to sit at this table and to say that this is the vision of the mission of the Commission without saying that the person that's receiving the information that you're going to be presenting to them about children and the Internet, we have to be sensitive to the fact that these people did not grow up with computers.

They are like many CEO's that have cars that drive them around and secretaries that type or legislative assistants that type.

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: And to print out their e-mail for them.

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: And print out their e-mail. So it is concerning to me that we have to -- and it's a very delicate issue, because I have found when you reach people at that kind of level they don't want to go to a class. They want to be advised one on one.

But we cannot fulfil our responsibility to have them understand these issues with children unless they themselves become aware. I think that what I have recommended to Senator Breaux, and he was quite interested in this, is taking a contingent of Congressional and Senator Representatives on a learning journey, as many of the other countries are doing and many of the corporations are doing, and going to really understand what are these issues, what are the issues that high tech companies are dealing with.

It's a very big concern, I think. I mean, I said to Congressman Nadler: Here's your district and your district's been fundamentally changed and you have a chance to learn about these issues in your district. And he's very interested in doing that.

S I think we've got some of the Congress and Senators that want to do that, but we have to evangelize it as a movement. When I said this to Senator Breaux, I said: And they could dress business casual. And he said: Well, for some that's a three-piece suit. That might be his joke, but I think his joke is indicative of the fact that -- here's what my concern is, frankly. I have older citizens that are 95 years old in nursing homes that are incredibly lonely, and their creativity doesn't get to be -- they don't get to surf the web and see museums. They don't get to send e-mail to their children and grandchildren.

These people are very capable of dealing with the isolation and the loneliness and the fact that they can be productive members of society. That's what my vision and work is all about.

I can't have Congressmen talking about the information literacy needs of older citizens and accessing social security and understanding health-related issues and understanding whether they should use a pharmacy online or not if they themselves are not computer-literate.

It's not even computer-literate. It's being able to know, how can you write and vote on legislation about pharmacies and privacy related to pharmacies and privacy related to health information if you yourself don't understand the difference between e-mail and a web site.

So I think that in the next six months a key part of our goals has to be to make sure that every member of Congress knows the vocabulary and the issues on a firsthand basis.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Yes.

COMMISSIONER HIGHTOWER: May I respond? I think, Mary, that you may be underestimating Congress. I was in Congress when we bought the first computers. They gave each of us seven to assign to the members, to the staff people. I put one over in the corner and said we'll have that as a floater for everybody that doesn't have one.

Then we had a person come in to train. I didn't want to be the most ignorant person in the office, so I trained with all of them. I would imagine -- and of course this has been a while back, but I would imagine that most of the members of Congress, because of the tremendous amount of information they get through e-mail and available through web sites, are far more computer literate than you're giving them credit for being.

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: Well, that's wonderful news, and I always thought you were a leader and an early adopter. But my experience, even with some of the presidential candidates, when asked questions about the Internet thought that they were talking about e-mail, not about the e-mail.

COMMISSIONER HIGHTOWER: Well, that may have been a reflection more of the way the question was posed than the answer.

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: Okay, so the question is, if that's the case and they all understand that, that's terrific.

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: I get all my e-mail on the Internet.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Okay, just a sec. I think this is something that we have to think about, but let's move on, because there will be a place to plug this in when we get down to the goals and the outcomes.

MR. WILLARD: If you turn the page A- 2, I refer to paragraphs 1 through 8 as the thou shalt's. This is really what the Commission is told to do by the law. We come up with one or two or three-word phrases to describe what they are, so we'll talk more about each one.

But "advise the President and the Congress," which actually is, the way I look at it, the legislation felt this was such an important mission that it said it twice, because you'll see also that advising it number 5. Number 1 says you "shall advise the President and Congress." Number 5 says you are authorized to provide advice to just about everybody else in the world.

"Measuring" is just shorthand for conducting studies and so on. "Assessing" is evaluating what you know and after you've done the measuring doing some qualitative evaluation of that. "National planning" is something that says -- and this is where Martha's comment about being proactive -- this is where you try to put together an overarching statement about where -- this is not our plan for running the Commission. This is the national plan for optimizing library in information resources.

"Advising" I already mentioned. Promoting global R and D captures a bunch of concepts we'll get to more, but this is the only place where the international aspect of our work gets captured. Reporting, the whole idea of doing an annual report, making publications.

Then the newly assigned responsibility that came out of the LST Act in 1996 of advising IMLS.

So we will go through each one of those in turn, and with each one of them those of you who were on the Executive Committee or sat in on that meeting know that every one of the statutory phrases was pasted up on a big flip chart piece of paper and then we had little sticky notes that had different actions that we thought could support those, and we moved them around and the presentation you'll see is a result of all of that work of assigning various actions to specific goals.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: Bob, may I say something? I think we have to be -- if you go to the chart before this, can we go back to the chart before this?

(Slide.)

The one before.

(Slide.)

Yes. This was thought of when the money that the Commission has was in sync. It wasn't a lot, but it was in sync with this kind of thing. To do this fully, I think we have to realize what we would need as resources and that we do not have those resources, and I think we have to keep

that in mind all the time, what can we do, because otherwise you get a scattershot, a little here, a little here, a little here, but it doesn't come into a packet.

I think the only -- I've given a lot of thought to this. I think the only way we can bring it into a packet is to choose those things we can do with our resources.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: I think we refer to that as prioritizing, strategic planning.

MR. WILLARD: That's what we're doing.

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: I would like to endorse what Joan has just said as very important. I would just like to underline that and highlight it in the notes as the most important issue to discuss, and also to say that you might have been amused about my comment about the education of Congress. My point of view on this is that if you educated them about the scope of the issues, the funding for this would come. And until they're educated about the scope of the issues, the funding will never come, because we will only be able to say it's a small agenda that we are able to achieve, a smaller platform, because the budget only allows us to do X or Y.

I personally feel that we're remiss unless we advocate for the resources to deal with all of these issues, because these are the issues that brought us all here and they're the work I think that Martha can lead and Bob can lead for us to accomplish. I have a lot of confidence in that.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: We'll try.

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: So my sense is unless we take a large -- if Jeanne were sitting at this table she would say: Let's fight the fight. And if the "fight the fight" is partly educating them as to the scope of the issues, it won't become a budget issue in the future. And the awareness around these issues and the Internet, I think, for those that are not online is soon to come, because Lou Gerstner recently said if a CEO in America does not have Internet and these issues on the table for their strategic plan they shouldn't be leading their company right now.

So there's really broadened awareness in the districts, in the executives in their districts, which help them fund the campaigns. So my sense is we've got to guide them about this and then let them vote in a larger Commission budget to deal with these issues, so that it triples in the years to come or something.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Thank you.

Bob.

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: Do you disagree?

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: No.

MR. WILLARD: No.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: This is exactly the direction we're moving in.

(Slide.)

MR. WILLARD: I can tell you that -- and Martha I'm sure will support this -- that many times Martha says why don't we do such and such, and I say what do you want to give up? So we do have that prioritization issue always on the table.

What strategic planning does is allows you to identify what you've already agreed to give up. Then it's one of the cliches of planning, but planning is not an outcome. You don't do a plan so you have a piece of paper or a book that you can put on the shelf. It is a process so that you've got a means of saying, within the context of our strategic plan, knowing our mission and our goals and the action steps that at a particular point in time we said were important, now with new knowledge we say: That particular action step is less important now and this other one is more important, and it still fits within the plan and it has been thought about ahead of time.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Abe.

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: I guess it's worth mentioning and pointing out and reminding ourselves that our Director has been very aggressive in proposing for a fuller budget and in fact probably made the point best by showing that by using very conservative inflation figures that the \$750,000 that we started with would have been well over \$2 million for the year before last. 2.7 was the first thing I saw, then over 3 million.

I don't think a 30 percent increase and a 50 percent increase are baby steps. I think we're headed in the right direction and things like the NTIS work and looking at GPO will probably make our value in the kind of work that we can do more obvious to the people that are funding.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: You will remember that when the NTIS situation came up we moved very quickly. We now have the report out. One of the things about strategic planning also is it allows you to be flexible. In other words, when you set your goals and objectives you don't put them into concrete and you can react very quickly. And because we had completed phases one and two of the GPO assessment, we were able to move very, very quickly on the NTIS, and the report now has gone to the Congress and to the President and to the Vice President and to the Speaker of the House.

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: And to the GPO and to the Library of Congress, the Department of Commerce.

MR. WILLARD: Well, to everybody in the world. And there are some very, very good outcomes that we are now looking at from being able to move so quickly. So this is a perfect example.

But now, you know, we're down to goal one and we need to set some action items.

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: So let me say, let me suggest here that I think you're absolutely right that there's been a lot of progress, but what I have observed in the plate- shifting economics of the country is that the Internet economy has caused a dramatic shift in sort of a total awareness that people have about these issues.

So I think while we made amazing progress, I think the possibility to have a \$10 to \$20 million budget in the next two years to explore some of these issues is there now. The reason I say that is because there's an increasing awareness of -- New York I think has flipped on its head since the Time Warner-AOL deal. They have like suddenly woken up to the Internet from four months ago where they didn't understand it before.

That's why all the Congressmen in New York are very interested in learning about this. So my sense is you have new power centers that can exponentially grow the mandate of what you're trying to do. It's not that we haven't done a brilliant job. I think, yes, it's been very well done.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: We have been building a foundation.

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: Right.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: And now we're going to build the --

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: My only sense is that as a Commissioner it has to be representative of how fast the scope of the economy is changing, and that's why. The climate is here now. So that's what I would recommend.

MR. WILLARD: I'd just like to add, thank Abe for the comments, but I want to add a new perspective on that. I was really proud when we came up with that analysis. I said: Aha, this is great insight. \$750,000 is what Congress said we should have in order to run us. Joan indicated that back then they said do this and here's the money to do it. Now that money isn't worth the same.

But I talked to a businessman and he said, forget that sort of analysis, and I believe him. He said: You have to define what it is that you will do that is worth the money, not that somebody said in the past you should have this and here's what it is in real dollars, but if we have the dollars this is what we can do; if we don't have the dollars it won't get done.

That -- I keep coming back to it. That's why we have to go through this exercise to say what it is that we should be doing.

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: So an action item, for example, then -- right?

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Yes.

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: Okay. Specifically here's a suggestion: To advise the President and Congress -- this is to advise Congress -- to discern how we might create a personal coach as needed for each Congressman who would like to be advised specifically on what the

Internet is, how to use it, what are the core issues, and what's the vocabulary, and what are the decision points that they are likely to have to think about within the frameworks that they are responsible for.

So that we would offer personal coaching to any Congressional representative that doesn't fit into Jack's description of already being computer literate. So maybe it's just one-tenth of the Congress, but we would go for that tenth and we would offer that to them.

COMMISSIONER HIGHTOWER: May I respond?

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Yes, Jack.

COMMISSIONER HIGHTOWER: Mary, Congress is 535 superegos.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER HIGHTOWER: Superegos.

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: As long as they're in office, only as long as they're in office.

COMMISSIONER HIGHTOWER: That's right, but you lose that ego immediately when you leave. You are put in your place by the people. They say: We've elected you, we can unelect you. You are one of us now.

I'm not trying to be a smart aleck about it. I'm just saying that I think most members of Congress would tell you that they themselves either have that knowledge or they have a staff person that has the knowledge. You don't ever admit that you're ignorant. You let other people come to that conclusion on their own.

(Laughter.)

But I think -- really, that's the purpose of most of the staff. I have not checked. I'm going to check, and I'm glad we've had this discussion because I'm going to check, but I believe that probably 99 percent of the members of Congress have a computer expert on their staff. You almost have to do that.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: They do.

MR. WILLARD: They all do.

COMMISSIONER HIGHTOWER: You almost have to do that. And I think for us to tell them - now I think this is wonderful (indicating). I'm looking forward. I'm not going to promise you I'm going to read every word, no. But I'm going to skim it pretty good.

A lot of the members of Congress will skim this. Not a lot. Maybe I'm being too optimistic. Some members of Congress will skim this. A larger number will have a staff person who will

study it. A larger number will have somebody on their staff that will be able to respond to Bob or to Martha or to any of us when we call and ask them questions about it.

But the problem is that we're a small agency and we have produced this. You wouldn't believe the amount of paper that comes into a Congressman's office every day, studies like this.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Could I follow up on something that you said quickly?

COMMISSIONER HIGHTOWER: Sure.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: When I met with Congresswoman Berkeley -- was it last week or the week before -- her senior staff person said that she, from a small state, receives on the average between 2500 and 3,000 e-mails per day -- not per week, per day.

Now, when you begin to look at that kind of a work load, I find myself saying maybe we have to rethink how we contact our legislators, because your e-mails get lost in the shuffle. The bottom line is there is nothing so good as walking into the local office and into the daily mail sack goes your letter with a highlighted attachment that says "Read: Important." That's how I get things to our Senators and Congressperson.

So I just put this out. The amount of work that every Congressperson has to face is enormous and they depend on staff.

Bob.

MR. WILLARD: I think I find myself very much in agreement with Mary that there needs to be some means of communication that says here is what this technology means in terms of the library and information services or the library and information needs of the people, because that's what we're concerned about.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Yes.

MR. WILLARD: And we have to figure out how to get past the channel clutter. I think that now, having an additional person on our staff who is responsible for public communications and legislative relations, we've got the beginnings of that. It is not simple.

What Martha just described, sure, absolutely. But there are 16 Commissioners when we're at full strength. There are 535 legislators. That math doesn't work.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: I'm going to let Joan and then you, Mary.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: I'd just like to say that I agree with you, Jack, that there is an enormous difference between having a tekkie on the staff who does all the attachments and goodness knows what else and the legislator understanding the meaning of that. Those are two things.

We don't have to tell them that -- we don't have to talk tekkie stuff to them, but I think what we do have to do is to talk the bigger issue.

COMMISSIONER HIGHTOWER: But the bigger the issue you make it, the more inclined they're going to be to listen to you.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Yes.

COMMISSIONER HIGHTOWER: But you don't go in and say, Congressman, you don't understand this, let me explain it to you. You might as well go out the door right then.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: I agree.

COMMISSIONER HIGHTOWER: You don't do it that way.

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: Let me just say that the experience I had in ten years helping former CEO's and CEO's, one does not go into a CEO and say: Let me explain to you what you don't know. One has to be incredibly sensitive about being a guide to someone to inform them about the issues.

I know exactly what you're saying about the egos here. What I'm talking about is slightly different. I'm talking about in Japan the prime minister of Japan has set three priorities for the country. One is the information literacy of the country, one is working with older adults and baby boomers in dealing the age issues, and I do not know the third priority for Japan, but those are the three main issues.

The delegation that recently visited Silicon Valley from France, including the economic prime minister of France, did not send his tekkie in to learn. He himself came in to learn about these issues. In Singapore, where there's an advanced computer literacy program for all of the citizens of Singapore, the legislature does not have tekkies that understand these issues; the legislators understand these issues.

In Finland, where 75 percent of the country is incredibly literate around new technology, including the older adults that need the new technology, the legislators in Finland understand these issues.

It is not okay in America to say we have a tekkie on staff that understands these issues, when the whole flux of the economy is changing. I am not suggesting we go in and treat them like school children and say, here's a modem and here's this. I'm suggesting that they have the basic understanding that's not here's an e-mail, but basic understanding about the core issues so that they can be as competitive as the legislators in Japan, Finland, Singapore, Australia, and other countries where there is a legislature where everyone does have that.

I think it's part of the Commission's mandate to say if you do not have those skills then we will provide the kind of coaching for you in a way that will help you, not in a way that doesn't honor

the role and the leadership that you bring to the Congress. So I think it's got to be a very sensitively done way.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Yes, Denise. And then did you want to? Denise and then Jose.

MS. DAVIS: I just want to suggest that there may be an opportunity here to work with ALA and get libraries to do this for us. What we need to do I think is get the message out and just bring it to the forefront for libraries and have them do it locally.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: And again, you're coming back to the whole issue of information literacy.

Jose.

COMMISSIONER GRIFFITHS: I was just going to say, maybe if you couch this in terms of briefing the Congressional representatives rather than coaching, it's probably more the kind of thing that they're used to. Certainly the Midwest universities have set up several sessions of this type where we've set aside a couple of hours, had a briefing on different issues. We did one for Internet 2, for example, and then did a question and answer session, and we had standing room only.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Could I suggest that an action item then would be the ability to bring together some kind of briefing sessions for members of Congress on the issues around information literacy.

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: I think that's a great action item, and I think that the goal should be that within a year that every Congressional Representative has the opportunity to be briefed, over the next two years everyone has the opportunity to be briefed on what are the core things they need to understand to be a decisionmaker.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Those would be the expected outcomes.

Yes, Jose.

COMMISSIONER GRIFFITHS: This would be another expected outcome, that once people are fully aware that this Commission is engaged in those issues then they will come to us more frequently ahead of time rather than after the fact.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Correct, good.

Yes, Jack.

COMMISSIONER HIGHTOWER: I think even if we do the briefing, when we announce it to them that it's available, we're going to have a lot of staff people show up.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: That's okay.

COMMISSIONER HIGHTOWER: Well, sure. I'm just saying that's getting back to my point originally that either they're going to do it or they're going to see that it's done. And if we get 25 staff people come to a briefing, that's great. But don't expect the member to come.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Remember that one of the constants in Congress are not necessarily the elected officials, they're the senior staff people.

COMMISSIONER HIGHTOWER: That's right.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: On Thursday Beth and I are going to visit David Vitter from Louisiana, who I've known for a long time personally, and we're going to visit him in the afternoon. Let me get together with you people and find out how to couch the question of: David, how can we best help you? We are your Commission; how can we best help you?

This is a very savvy guy. He's a Rhodes scholar and a very savvy guy.

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: I think that's a brilliant suggestion, Joan. In my conversation with Congressman Nadler, and his district is Silicon Alley, I offered to introduce him to all of the leaders down there in his district and ask members of his district when they had a major event in their company, like a financing or a public offering, that they give back in his district to some of the personal needs of the district, give it to the settlement houses, give it to the libraries -- make that whole district a model district in terms of new media economy and how they give back.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: Are you saying that he's from San Jose?

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: No, he's from Silicon Alley in New York.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: Excuse me, I thought you said "Silicon Valley."

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: It turns out that in New York there's a Silicon Alley, and I think if we could begin to see some case studies where really civic improvements were made in libraries, in nursing homes and schools that came as a result of a Congressman understanding the impact of the digital economy in his district and having those entrepreneurs know that the Congressman is literate on issues like bandwidth and what "pipes" mean and transportation and other issues that they're concerned about, employment of foreign workers that are technologists - these are the issues that concern the new media economy and they feel like they don't have someone that understands those issues.

So what I think we can do is begin to seed some model districts, and there are probably people in Congress that I don't even know about that are evangelists of these ideas. So I think that if you could get a bit of momentum going there it's going to be very helpful to them.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: I'm going to ask you to do something before you leave today: Put on a piece of paper for me, so I'm fully briefed to go to David Vitter, those things that you just mentioned.

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: Sure.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: We have then one very specific action item here and a lot of what you're discussing now really are the outcomes. But we still have some other action items that we are in the process of doing. That is, to continue with NTIS.

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: And the GPO.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: And the GPO. Don't forget what we already have in the pipeline.

MR. WILLARD: Well, in a way I agree with that. But in another way, as we go I purposely have not suggested curtailing this discussion on this particular issue. But I will also now say that this particular issue is a tiny piece of everything that we potentially can be doing. And we do have to carry through nine different objectives and assign action goals.

I would, before Mary says it herself, I will say that by having the legislators more aware of the policy issues we probably get support on the other things we need to work on. But I do think that I wanted you to see how much conversation just one action item can take, and we could continue on it. But we do need to -- and that's why this planning is not something that you do in a half an hour or an hour. It's a continuing process.

But as we go through these nine objectives, we'll have to discipline ourselves in terms of how much discussion any potential action item takes.

One thing that that, when the Executive Committee was first dealing with applying all these little sticky notes that represented action items to each of the objectives, we came up with four categories into which we put them. It'll become apparent as we go on, but just let me for an overview tell you that the four categories were: mandatory, that which there was no question that if we were going to exist at all we had to do.

The second was what we considered mandatory but we didn't yet have the money for, so we called it mandatory unfunded. That meant that we felt if we were to exist we had to do it and somehow we had to come up with the money for it.

The third was desirable and these were things that -- you know, it's a gradation - - you don't have the money, you're not going to work as hard to get the money as you would with the mandatory unfunded.

The fourth we originally started calling nice, but we really needed to put it sort of at the bottom of the list, not lose track of it. That category got shorthanded to "nice but," and after about three times of saying "nice but" I thought that's probably not the right term we want to use. So we this

morning came up with a new term for it and it's called backburner. So the fourth category is a backburner issue and you'll see that reflected here.

Now, this particular one in goal one -- oh, and then there was uncategorized, where we hadn't reached a decision yet.

So here with goal one you'll see the action items, and again it's very shorthand. But we are coming up on our thirtieth anniversary. Using that, using the history, using the commitment that was evident in the establishment of this organization, we can use that as a means for communicating with the President and the Congress about these issues. So it was considered a desirable.

Uncategorized because it was so broad, advise Congress and advise President. We could probably just take that off because it's implicit in each of the individual things.

But two things that came out, specific things, was the Executive Branch put a lot of time and money into something called the National Information Infrastructure Advisory Council. They had meetings all over the country. They came out with a couple of good reports, and then they went away.

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: Is that Magaziner?

MR. WILLARD: No, that was earlier on. It was Del Lewis and McCracken.

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: Ed McCracken.

MR. WILLARD: They were chairs. It was a wonderful committee. I attended a lot of their meetings.

But now we are five years after that report's issued. Wouldn't it be a good activity for this Commission to take what they recommended and see how it's done, maybe reconvene as many of them as are willing to participate, that sort of thing? So it's an activity and it certainly would fit into the process of advising the President because he brought them together to begin with.

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: Well, I would say that's true, except the question I don't know is does the Internet 2 Committee supplant the NII.

MR. WILLARD: No.

COMMISSIONER GRIFFITHS: No, I don't think so.

MR. WILLARD: In all candor, the NII Advisory Council came into being because the Commission was not well known. It would be entirely appropriate for a President to come in and say: Here are these issues, Commission, NCLIS.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: But we don't have the capability to. We would have to stop everything else.

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: Not if we got the resources they got, though. They were given resources to meet.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: We would have to meet. We would have to go all over.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: But we couldn't do it unless they gave us the resources, and if the President was saying, this is what we want you to do, then we would say to him, that's fine, give us the money and we'll do it.

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: I guess the question I have on the thirtieth anniversary -- I'd be interested in Jack's point of view on this -- is the fact that NCLIS has a thirtieth anniversary is one way to come in to introduce yourself to Congress. A second way would be to say: We're losing in the global competitive world in terms of our thought leadership unless we have deeper understanding of these particular issues which are affecting citizens in your district.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Before we go further on this whole issue of the thirtieth anniversary and how to handle it, it is an agenda item this afternoon to very specifically address it. So put those thoughts aside as a detailed discussion until this afternoon.

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: I guess the concern I have, Martha, is not the detailed discussion of the anniversary. The concern I have is in the communication of these issues, which I think are vital, what are the touchstone points where the Congressional person is coming from that we should work with in order to have these issues come to the fore.

I mean, where are they coming from? Are they going to be there because they're inspired about the history or are they going to be there because they're concerned about being reelected in their district because they don't understand the new economy? So what are the touchstone points for them? Do you see what I'm saying.

MR. WILLARD: No.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Yes, I understand.

(Slide.)

MR. WILLARD: Let's jump to the second goal, which is probably the longest.

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: You didn't say anything about the State of the Union. That's too obvious.

MR. WILLARD: Basically, the State of the Union Address is something where we've got this one finite event and you have all sorts of interests pouring into that in the weeks and months

beforehand. The television show "West Wing" focused on that not too long ago, how everybody wants to get their one sentence in, and it's something that we ought not to be insensitive to.

I wouldn't urge the Commission to assign the staff a lot of time on that, but on the other hand if there is somebody who just happens to have a friend in the speechwriters office that's a good channel to use and to say let's remember library and information services. That was the reason it was there.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Actually, even if we don't have a friend there's nothing to stop the Commission from sending something to the speechwriters office saying these are issues that were discussed by the President during the campaign and, respectively, blah, blah, blah. So it's something we can think about, perhaps even do.

MR. WILLARD: The second one, using the shorthand term "Measuring," gets into all of the things that we are authorized to do in terms of holding hearings, conducting studies, analyses, all of that stuff -- surveys, rather. So you can read the language.

(Slide.)

Some of the action items pertaining to that. There are a lot in this area. You'll see it actually goes to two slides, in all four categories. So I think just some discussion on what are the ones there that you think are appropriate or inappropriate, are too highly rates, not highly enough rated.

COMMISSIONER GRIFFITHS: Well, it looks as though literacy should go up to one of the mandatories, from the discussion that we had yesterday and today. It's on "desirable" at the moment.

MR. WILLARD: And are you saying just literacy?

COMMISSIONER GRIFFITHS: No, information literacy. Excuse me.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Information literacy.

MR. WILLARD: As a couple, the two together?

COMMISSIONER GRIFFITHS: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Now, we've done a GPO study phase two and I think that if there is support for the recommendations on the NTIS that we follow through with additional work next year, that has to go up to a higher category.

MR. WILLARD: Again, the structure we're dealing with is measuring, analyzing, recommending. Phase two was in measuring.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: That's right, it's completed.

MR. WILLARD: There's no more measuring, at at least I would contend at this point there's no more measuring we want to do. It's more in the later goals that we deal with it. So it's not moving higher on this. It's moving toward recognizing it in the appropriate goal.

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: Except that I still have in there "measuring the information literacy needs of the decisionmakers," the policy decisionmakers. So I want to make sure that we have explicit understanding about the information literacy needs of our policy decisionmakers at all levels, the primary decisionmakers.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Okay. Now, in terms of measuring, I feel so strongly about school libraries right now. We've done a lot of work with public libraries over the past few years, but we have done nothing for school libraries, and I really would like to see us -- and where I am? Right here, school libraries. That comes under, it has it under statistics, and I think that's where we start, what's happening with school libraries, and once we've done the measuring we can assess the information and make the recommendations.

So I really would like to see school libraries become a priority item. In fact, I'm going to dig my heels in on that one.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: I think that if the Chairperson has a particular interest that they want to follow, I think the Commission has the responsibility to line up behind it, I really do.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Because this addresses information literacy. It addresses literacy, it addresses the education concerns of both our candidates, and that certainly can bleed over into the person I hope will become our next President. I'm trying to be very cautious here.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: And I don't think that the Chair has in the past done that very often.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: No.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: In my experience, and I think it's important and I just want to say that, it wouldn't be my priority, but that doesn't make any difference. I think the Chair has every right to pick a priority and say this is it.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: But we're not looking at school libraries as an isolated item. It's how they interact also with public libraries, with other community groups, in partnerships. There are lots of issues there that we can build around.

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: I guess what I hear you saying is the recognition that we are as a mandatory item gathering statistics on school libraries, but we want to put school libraries in national planning and advising.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Yes, that is correct.

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: Martha, I would endorse that as well, the priority that you're setting. I guess the question, the sub- theme, I would say is that one needs to probe it fairly deeply to know, to what extent have classrooms and the Internet supplanted some of the things that happened in the school library.

So if we could take a snapshot to find out, have some of the classroom teachers become so computer literate that the children have access to a lot of the databases.

Secondly, somehow I see your role in a learning journey with some of the Congressional members, not just for a photo op in their district, but to really get in there and to say here is how the education is changing, because I think Abe was right yesterday when he said new teachers are coming out with these skills.

So I'm thinking that those classrooms those teachers are in are going to be pretty computer literate. So one needs to look at what is the new function of the library, yes.

MR. WILLARD: Yes.

MS. DAVIS: The National Library of Education sponsored a study a year ago that was recently released, both the summary report and the full document, which I shared with the Commission, with information about it. We're waiting for GPO to get copies of it. Once they have copies everybody will get it.

COMMISSIONER SYWETZ: May I?

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Yes, Betsy.

COMMISSIONER SYWETZ: As I listen to this conversation, it occurs to me that -- and going back to the issue of resources -- it occurs to me that there are two ways, and probably more, that you can think about it. One is to do it yourself with limited resources. The other is what can you get others to do.

Particularly with school and libraries, it is not just the responsibility of the library community to address this issue. To follow up on what you're saying, what is the Department of Education going to be doing? What are other agencies going to be doing, and how can the Commission influence those agencies to do what we believe is in the greater public good.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Thank you. So we'll move that one up to mandatory, or it is under mandatory.

MR. WILLARD: Again, I'll beat this dead horse, but it is the measuring aspect of it that we're talking about right now.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Yes.

MR. WILLARD: And it was actually one of the concepts that grew out of San Antonio. Maybe let me try it just to describe it. Maybe we need to get a flip chart in here and write it down, but this is a process.

If you look at the goals of going from measuring to assessing to planning to advising, it moves across a spectrum and a particular topic will be higher or lower in that process. So for example, measuring what the information literacy of our population and what the information literacy of our policymakers is is something that's before you even assess what you can do to improve it, if it needs improvement.

That is something that I find I do myself and the Commissioners have done, is it's hard to keep it in just one box, just thinking, okay, all we're talking about right now is where it is relatively related to other things in terms of measuring activities.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Jose.

COMMISSIONER GRIFFITHS: I just wanted to say maybe in a sense we should merge measuring and assessing, so that we can always be sure that the measurement we do is for the purpose of assessment and then we can say we've done it once we've made an assessment of adequacy, before we move into planning: This is where we are, this is what we think, we think it's adequate or not adequate, here are the gaps; and the next question will be, well, what do we propose should be done about it.

So that it's very, very hard to separate measuring from assessing.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Both sides of the coin.

COMMISSIONER GRIFFITHS: Yes.

MR. WILLARD: Yes. In other words, subsection 2 and subsection 3 of the law should always be thought of as a whole.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Okay. Yes?

MS. DAVIS: Just a piece of information that I'd like to put on the table for the group's awareness. The work that was done by Westat to look at the implementation of Goals 2000 and the support of those goals by public libraries and school library media centers cost \$1.3 million. We are not talking a little bit of money here.

So it's very important when you look at the word "statistics" and you leapfrog perhaps to implementation of a study that we are talking our budget, basically, to do a study of that magnitude. So just to put it in real terms.

MR. WILLARD: This is an example of where the concept of cooperation with other agencies that Betsy made reference to, and other entities, not just agencies.

But let me also call your attention just so you keep it in back of your mind always, on page A-4 the paragraph that has parenthesis (f). We have a direction in our law that says the heads of all federal agencies are directed to cooperate with us in carrying out the purposes of this chapter.

We haven't done much on that because that takes work, too. But I feel very comfortable in taking that and waving it in front of me and saying to the Secretary of Education: Congress wants you to help us; here are some ideas.

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: We did that on the GPO study, didn't we?

MR. WILLARD: A little.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: A little. Not a lot, but a little.

I'm concerned. We're still on goal two and we have a few more to get through. We certainly are looking at a number of issues. What other issues do we want to highlight above and beyond what we have on the backburner?

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: To the point earlier about what conferences are you going to and what are you measuring, if you look at the complexion of Seattle, because so many people have become millionaires up there, they've changed the social-cultural landscape of Seattle because they've given a lot of money away into the city.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: They've also just recently lost a lot of money in the stock market.

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: But nevertheless, there have been enough people there that have given back in a record way. So it's an indicator of what could happen in the country if other people began to give back in the same way. So how will we measure where the philanthropy dollars are going to come from that are going to help support the initiatives that are here? Because if we could provide some case study models of communities that have taken explosive growth in the dot-com economy and put that back into changing the libraries, the schools, we might provide some models for other districts to do that.

So how do you measure that? I don't know, but it's something we should look at because you have to go where the money is.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: I've made a note of that.

Abe.

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: Just a footnote. It has come to my attention that, specifically in Seattle, most of the entities, including the Gates Foundation, that receive stock sell it immediately. So their portfolio doesn't go down with the stock market. It's my understanding that presently the Gates Foundation owns no Microsoft stock, zero.

MR. WILLARD: They probably own other high tech stocks.

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: No, they own no stock. Everything that's given to them they sell immediately.

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: Here's a trend, for instance, and I don't know how you capture it. The people are now allocating stock options to nonprofit charities as part of the IPO's in certain districts. So people are not even just saying -- they're in the "adopt a library" thing, adopt a library as part of your public offering.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: That's a good idea.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Yes. Let's go on.

(Slide.)

MR. WILLARD: This is a snapshot in time. The prioritization was essentially as of last June, July, and therefore LIS for individuals with disabilities was very much on our mind because two weeks hence we were going to hold a hearing.

Well, we've held a hearing. Is this still an issue that is still ranked high? Is this something the Commission should be doing? Or does this need to be -- again, in terms of measuring --

COMMISSIONER GRIFFITHS: It's a very, very particular case of the digital divide that I think might be worth pointing out.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: Say that again? I didn't hear you.

COMMISSIONER GRIFFITHS: It's a very particular case of the digital divide that usually doesn't come to mind immediately. When you think of the digital divide, people talk about socially and economically deprived, not people with various forms of disability who are just as equally deprived for access.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: If you're on the Up For Grabs Benton listserv, there has been an enormous amount of discussion in terms of people with disabilities who have been ignored in this whole issue of the digital divide, and there are some very interesting things that are going on that nobody is aware of.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: In England, Bob, you remember the man who spoke from the Association for the Blind? When they tried to get things on the screen for the blind, they run smack into copyrights.

COMMISSIONER GRIFFITHS: Yes. Same here.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: That's right.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: And you remember he spoke most movingly about what an outrage this was and that the blind were being left out because copyright kicks in and the people don't want to give up the copyright.

COMMISSIONER GRIFFITHS: It's exactly the same thing here, Joan, exactly the same thing.

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: In fact, we heard the edge of that concern at Gallaudet.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: Where?

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: At Gallaudet College we heard just the edge of that.

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: I think in terms of, I would endorse this, too. I think one of the things you have to look at is the aging of the boomers. So the boomers are now 54 and there are 16 years of boomers. When you're 54 you start to get a few disabilities.

So one of them is eyesight, next is hearing. So the President has hearing aids. And then eight out of ten have some health-related problem. So we really have to educate people about this issue because so many people are going to have disabilities and it's going to be more people with disabilities than not with disabilities in the next 16 years, because we've got the aging of the population of the boomers.

So they're suddenly going to get really cranky about these issues because they can't see and they can't hear as well as they used to.

COMMISSIONER GRIFFITHS: And they forget things.

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: And they forget things, yes.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: But it's how this --

COMMISSIONER HIGHTOWER: And there was something else --

(Laughter.)

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: But we can't remember what it is.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: How does this impact, not the thing itself, but how does it impact?

MR. WILLARD: Can I take everybody back for just a second to Economics 101. One of the curves you learned in Economics 101 is the guns-butter curve, which is basically a curve that says, okay, are you going to spend a lot on guns or are you going to spend a lot on butter, but if you spend a lot on butter you can't spend as much as you want on guns.

That makes it a very binary choice. Suppose we said it's a binary choice, are we going to do something, are we going to heighten our attention to individuals' disabilities or are we going to do something about kids and the Internet? Now, I know it isn't that simple. We can -- we're able to handle multiple things.

But one of the cautions I would make is in advocating any one thing we have to think, am I saying this is so important that it gets to the top of the list?

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: Well, isn't that what we're doing? Isn't that what we're here for with this list?

MR. WILLARD: Are we saying that it goes to the top of the list?

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: No, no. Did we say this is at the top of the list?

MR. WILLARD: That's all I'm warning about is, that anybody who is advocating that particular thing, like Mary just did for disabilities and for older people, aging people who have disabilities as a consequence of aging, should we be putting a lot of energy into that?

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: Well then, are we going through, on goal two, are we going through all of these things and should we put numbers by them?

MR. WILLARD: I think one of the exercises -- we're not going to do it this time, but one of the exercises that is frequently done in strategic planning is, after you have winnowed them down and you have said these are the things that absolutely this Commission needs to be doing, they can't get off the list at all, then you give a certain number of stickers, ballots, to people and you have it all on the wall and they go around and they put up their votes, and you measure.

Didn't we do that, something like that?

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: We did it in Lake Tahoe.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: Isn't that what we're doing here in goal two, saying which we think are -- what are we doing with goal two? Maybe I don't understand.

MR. WILLARD: We're not at that point yet that we are advocating.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: Aren't we on goal two?

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: We still are on goal two.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: What are we doing?

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: We're just agreeing what they are, not the priorities.

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: If you think about it from the user's point of view --

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: I'm about to use the gavel.

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: I think if you think about it from the user's point of view, and I just spent the weekend in your home district of Reno, I could see that you could both take a group to Reno and you could say: Here are the issues that are going on with children in school libraries. You could say to them: Here are the issues that the disability community faces and, by the way, here's who's going to be disabled.

Wake them up to the notion that we've all lost our eyesight and the hearing is going next and X amount have had strokes and cardiac is around the corner for some of us. Just you've got to wake them up. You've got to hit them over the head.

Then, Martha, I have to tell you, best thing I've seen for the disability community ever is the casinos in Reno. They now have everything in large print, everything to easily get in and out. They have figured it out. If they could just take people to the casino as an example of a well designed environment for disabled people, it's amazing to me.

I could not believe it. it's the best designed place I have seen in my life. It's in your home district. If we could design everything for seniors that could be as easy to use as the Flamingo Hilton Casino, we would do a real service for the adult population, because they could get in, they could get out, they could get into restaurants, they could read menus, they could see the phone.

These are the issues that we face when we can't see. And you've got it right there. So you could do all of those things in one district visit to your home.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: I didn't want to bring the casinos up, but what I do want to suggest is that we will be publishing the proceedings and then from publishing the proceedings I think we can move to assessing and recommending, because you don't want to do something and then drop it in mid-stride.

So to some extent I think we have to continue with working with individuals with disabilities and pointing out that we do have a greying population. On the other hand, you have to remember that within the education world there has been mainstreaming and that has had an enormous impact on how teachers teach, how schools are being retrofitted.

This takes me back to the fact that if Reid's bill does pass and there is money for the improvement of schools, that is an issue where we can say you had better remember that. And it's just not recognizing ADA, it is implementing, and in some instances even going beyond implementation, because we learned when we did some work on retrofitting some of our branches that there are a few shortfalls in the ADA.

So that I think has to stay.

MR. WILLARD: Well, let me suggest one way of looking at it is, if we don't collapse the two I think what we really are saying is that we've done the measuring aspect of it.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: We've done the measuring of it.

MR. WILLARD: It is now time to move it into the assessing.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Yes, move it into the assessing. So this goes into the assessing.

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: And we're continuing to do the measurement in most of those cases.

COMMISSIONER GRIFFITHS: And with the Internet, same thing, right?

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: And we are going ahead, we're doing our, is it, our fifth or our sixth study on Internet connectivity.

MR. WILLARD: I think of it as the 2000 study.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: The 2000 study.

MS. DAVIS: Number six.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: It's number six, but we'll call it the 2000 study, and that is being done.

MS. DAVIS: Completed in August.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: And the "Kids and the Internet" is done.

COMMISSIONER GRIFFITHS: And we're moving into advisory.

MR. WILLARD: And we'll move it into advisory and reporting.

MS. RUSSELL: So we're deleting them under measuring because they're completed, is that it, Bob?

MR. WILLARD: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Yes, and we're moving them into the next phase.

MS. RUSSELL: And then also with the GPO phase --

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Same with that.

MS. RUSSELL: Because they're finished.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: And the FSCS --

MS. RUSSELL: That's ongoing.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: It's ongoing, isn't it?

MR. WILLARD: Yes.

MS. DAVIS: There are some corrections there, but I can give those to you offline.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Okay. Now, it was interesting, I had a meeting at 7:00 o'clock this morning with several of the Native American librarians, who have some real concerns about the approach in LSTA with the set-aside and they're going to be getting back to me with some of their concerns in writing.

But the one thing we're not looking at and the one thing we were active in, you remember Mary and Bobby, Jeanne and I, we served on that task force. Well, LSTA will be coming up for reauthorization and I really think that we need to be involved with the task force again, very much so, because we have some good statistical information. We have the proceedings from several hearings, and I think this comes under advising on the reauthorization. Does that make sense?

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: What was the point of view? Can you summarize it for us?

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: \$4,000 isn't worth a hill of beans when you consider the needs they have.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: They spoke to at meeting with me yesterday at the awards ceremony.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: And I think -- did I give you Lotsee's letter, Lotsee Paterson's letter? Oh, I gave it to you. But eventually it will be going to you, because she suggests some measuring needs.

So I think that, in terms of the reauthorization of LSTA, we ought to highlight how the set-asides are done, including the fact that they almost forgot Hawaii. It was a last minute addition.

COMMISSIONER BINGHAM: Would that be under advising?

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: I would think advising. I would put Native American under advising and tie it at this point to LSTA.

MR. WILLARD: So LSTA is there and Native Americans is one of the issues that we want not to lose sight of.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: That is correct, absolutely.

(Slide.)

MR. WILLARD: Now, how about on the "desirable" and "backburner"? Obviously, we can just strike Census 2000. That was just, we had been urged by the administration to be supportive of it.

The GPO study phase two is done.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Education reform and teacher preparation really is part of information literacy, teaching the teachers how to teach. Accreditation is becoming an issue with the American Library Association.

Jose.

COMMISSIONER GRIFFITHS: I was just going to say, actually the issue is not so much accreditation itself as the fact that we're facing a lack of doctoral level graduates who will go into the library schools. So I think within the next probably five to eight years we'll start seeing a crisis in faculty availability for libraries and library programs.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: I think that in terms also of -- when I went to the Congress of Professional Education, and they have now come up with a set of core values which just read beautifully, but I don't think mean a hell of a lot because they're not addressing how do we recruit for the profession, how do we provide continuing education for librarians like myself, who got their degree 30, 40 years ago, pre- computers, pre-technology.

But I think this is something we should just monitor and advise on in terms of what ALA is doing.

COMMISSIONER GRIFFITHS: Well, it is, it seems to me, related to the whole information literacy issue.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: It is.

COMMISSIONER GRIFFITHS: In that I believe that the role of the people we have heretofore called librarians is actually going to increase in the digital environment, and the problem is how are you going to ever be able to get enough people into those kinds of positions?

I think then that speaks to not just having master's level education, but also having more education at the undergraduate level and at the two-year college level, because we simply can't afford to have everybody we would need to have in place to help people get what they need to get access to.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: When I attended the Congress, I made the suggestion in the breakout group that I was with that we ought to look at the community colleges doing an AA

degree for paraprofessionals, the entry degree being the bachelors' and the specialization degree being the master's.

I have to tell you, I still have footprints on my back where they stomped on me. But this is something that is not going to go away, and it is the future of our profession.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: Martha, there would be a very good unintended consequence from getting the community colleges in because so many of the people in the community colleges speak another language. So you would have a cadre of people coming in there with other languages.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Mary.

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: First of all, I think leaders always have footprints on their back, Martha. So that's part of what you get when you get to be a leader. But I know how sometimes that hurts, but I have a lot of confidence in your rising to the occasion.

So let me just say that one of the things that I found most exciting about the presidential primaries was the discussion about the community colleges as venues for retraining. The people that you cited in England, Joan, I think were really an example of what I see.

So many people I know are, like we've been privileged to have Beth here, and I know she's retiring from one profession, but guess what, the boomers are 90 percent in debt and so they can never retire. So they're going to get re-engaged.

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: 91 percent.

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: 91 percent. They're going to get re-engaged. They can't retire. They were just thrilled about the legislation that was just signed on changing the social security thing to 70.

So I think if we could somehow point them to community colleges as a place where they can move into service as a librarian, because it's a great, fulfilling occupation, as we saw in such an inspiring, eloquent set of speeches last night. I think what people don't know is, oh, I can go do that there. So we have to almost have a marketing campaign that says: So you did 30 years at IBM; now become a librarian. So you did this; now become a librarian.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: That's essentially the job of the community colleges.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: May I suggest that this issue is one that we highlight under advising, and we will be working on professional organizations.

Yes.

MS. DAVIS: You need to add salaries to that pool of information that you're going to advise them on, because if you move in this direction the salaries need to be improved for those librarians who do have advanced degrees.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Yes.

MS. DAVIS: That's why you have footprints on your back.

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: But an issue that came up yesterday that I think Jose mentioned was the number of librarians going into dot-com companies. First of all, I was interested in that for personal reasons, but I think that this is not an unusual trend. Half of the MBA's coming out of schools are going into dot-com companies.

I think the question is how do we inspire -- what do we do about that issue of the dearth of leadership because they're going in that direction? How do you get the leaders for the library schools? I think that is an issue that's a really important one to take a look at, because it is a trend that's going to impact the future of libraries. So I don't know what to do about it.

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: Well, I think one thing is you have to pay an MLS person more than you pay a brand new school teacher who has never taught or done an hour of graduate work.

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: Here's where you get into the new media economy people can be helpful because they can underwrite that type of endowment for library schools if we can get to the Venture One conference or the Red Herring conference and have ten minutes with John Doerr, who influences a lot of people, including the President.

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: Subsidizing library schools doesn't raise the relative salaries of librarians.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: This goes to something else that Bob and I talked about, and that is that the issues that we're talking about today around the table are issues that we need to bring to such groups as the Governors Conference --

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: -- the League of Cities, the National Association of Counties, to begin to highlight what is happening in the information age, how it impacts local governments and how it impacts the funding entities for education, for schools, and for libraries.

Yes, Beth.

MS. BINGHAM: I keep thinking, I keep going back to the Singapore model. Mary mentioned it this morning. Yesterday I was talking about stresses on the library --

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: The wireless mike.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: Here, the wireless mike.

MS. BINGHAM: I keep going back to the Singapore model. I was so impressed with things I saw there, about how the libraries community brings in people from the outside to do what they know how to do best. If we could use that type of model for the computer industry -- the librarians are hassled because they're not the number one experts to be able to teach computer processing or to do this or that or the other.

That's another thing. Rosalie and I went to a meeting a couple weeks ago on literacy and a woman spoke on understanding poverty and how different people hear different messages from where you're coming from. If you go to the community college level, the people that are working day to day in librarians throughout the land do not necessarily have a master's degree. They understand what they have been trained to do.

This is perhaps something that, as far as advice, that could be to the library community, to not shortchange the people that you're hiring, but to prepare them or bring in the experts to be able to do what they do best, so that the library community can do what it does best.

That's my two cents.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: It makes a lot of sense.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: I'm enthusiastic about speaking before all these conferences, because we have Bob, who can really speak well. We are not without a first class speaker here and I think that gives us a leg up that we might not have otherwise for visibility of the Commission.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Yes, Jack.

COMMISSIONER HIGHTOWER: I'd like to respond to what Joan just said. Bob doesn't have anything to do, so, Bob, I want to make something else for you to do. It would be so helpful for me if I had an outline for some of these speeches that you have made. I'm capable of reading someone else's outline and making a pretty darn good speech. But it would be helpful for us to bring our thoughts together if we had, I think just for the Commissioners, if we can give that -- I get opportunities to speak more than I want to and I love to have something to say.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: This is part of our communications plan that Rosalie is putting into being.

COMMISSIONER HIGHTOWER: Good.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: But Rosalie has only been with us for, what, a month?

MS. VLACH: Three.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Three months.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: We have been urging Bob.

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: It just seems like a year.

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: Jack, really I've had a few regrets at this meeting and a tear shed or two, but one of my regrets is that I'm not going to be able to serve a long time on the Commission with you, because I find you totally delightful.

I can't imagine a more credible person walking the halls of the Russell Building if we could empower you with the issues like: Let me tell you what's going on in your district now, here's the bandwidth issues, here's the access issues, here's the way your boomers are getting disability, here's what's going on.

I think you could be a brilliant ambassador and I think probably the spirit of some former Commissioners lives inside of you in the kind of messages that you carry on there.

So I think with Bob's help and with your help, I would like to see a development wing of the Commission. By that I mean a budget that's a million dollars a year that goes into the development and communications of issues, that allows you to go to the key points and gives you not just a person on staff, but gives you the best PR agency that is there, that campaigns all of these issues, that are brochures and communications, and that you leverage LeVar Burton and Walter Anderson, who are brilliant spokespersons, and Jack.

I think who is more credible in higher education than Jose? Who is more credible as a librarian than Bobby or Rebecca?

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: Real estate.

(Laughter.)

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: Well, trust me. Real estate, put you on the road, they'd all go to hear what you're saying.

So I think we have to mobilize the Commission and give them the resources to be voices for these issues. I have a fair share of credibility among the older adult community. I think we have to show them we care and reflect those interests.

So if each of us gave three speeches a year to the right constituency, I think we could really be there to do that.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: This is something that we are going to be doing, there's no question about it.

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: But not with a million dollars.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Well, you know, we make little steps before we make great strides. And we're doing it already. Rebecca when she went to the Black Librarians Caucus, when she went to AASL, even though she had to beat them over the head to remind them that she was their Past President.

So there are a lot of things that we are beginning to do.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: I think one thing, Martha, we need is a list from the office of those things which are possible. I have no idea where I could be speaking.

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: I do.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: Rosalie will be getting it for you.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: Just something from the office of all the invitations that come in.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Yes.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: So that we can say which ones we would like --

MR. WILLARD: Candidly, there aren't a lot of invitations yet, but we can work at it. We can make it happen.

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: But also the notion of this: We can use the fact that the Commission would like to hold a hearing at the Venture One or Red Herring conference and three people go to listen to what the venture capitalist community wants to do to contribute to education, it's a theme. So you could go there, Joan, and just say what's on your mind; how are you all giving back. It would be so credible.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: We don't know what a "Red Herring" is.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: What is the Red Herring conference?

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: It's a conference where all of the venture capitalists go, and what's happening now is -- I only know this because I had to go there to speak, to see what language they spoke, which was very different than the aging community. They use none of the same words. We could be different dialects, trial dialects. Investment bankers and aging adults are totally different sects, s-e-c- t-s.

But what you have to understand is that the venture capital community, if you go to any conference now, half of the conversations are about education and giving back, half of the conversations. Tom Brokaw said: "We can't wire our world if we don't connect the soul." John Doerr, the leading venture capitalist in California, said at the last conference: "We need to be missionaries, not mercenaries."

What we don't know is the needs and how to reach the needs. We need to be the brokers of saying, here we can take this and hold a conference in all these different constituencies. We have the mantle of power to do that.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: They hold a conference one a year?

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: Three times a year. I'll get you the dates. I'll get those dates and then we can do that, yes.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: Good.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Let's move on.

MR. WILLARD: Before the thought gets lost, Mary will indeed be departing from the Commission on July 19th unless someone is appointed before that, and I don't anticipate that happening.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: You've got a lot of time before that, Mary.

MR. WILLARD: But one of the things that I have been working on sort of a very, very low level is, recognizing that former Commissioners are a tremendous resource for us, I've written to them all twice now. Unfortunately, one of those times was to inform them about Jeanne's death.

But the first letter I sent back in September or so was telling them that we do want to stay in touch with you. We want to look to you as a resource for the Commission. So I think the idea of identifying a former Commissioner who could go give a talk, especially as we get our communications plan in place and can give them the tools to make that, will multiple the resources we have for that particular mission.

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: I frankly think that you are the most powerful people to speak to Congressmen. And I love the way you describe the ego change that happens after Congress, because I think that's really true.

COMMISSIONER HIGHTOWER: Well, I got mine back soon.

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: And I'm so glad you did.

COMMISSIONER HIGHTOWER: And I have a story that --

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: I wish we could go off the record and you could tell the joke and not have the transcript. But we can't do that, okay.

Paul Simon has enormous integrity and credibility, and who more to understand Jeanne's vision than Paul? If we could not only use the Commission, but sort of friends of the Commission to sort of hit some of these points, I think they would be articulate and brilliant. And Mrs. Tsongas is one of the most amazing women I've ever met.

So there are other resource people that would care about this issue. It's about defining a new way of living in this country and that's what these entrepreneurs want to do, is to find the ways they can help.

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: You're not using "entrepreneurs" and "venture capitalists" as the same thing, are you?

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: I want to bring this back, please, to the agenda. We only have 30 minutes left.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: Where are we on this sheet?

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: We are down to about to go to assessing.

MR. WILLARD: Have we got everything off here we want to get off here?

MS. RUSSELL: But, are you moving the LIS accreditation and all that discussion onto desirable?

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: We're moving it to advisory.

MS. RUSSELL: Moving it to advisory, okay.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: What about journal pricing, Jose? Do you want to continue it under measuring?

COMMISSIONER GRIFFITHS: We're waiting for the input from the big twelve librarians group, at which point we then might move it to the advising. It's beginning, I think, to sort itself out anyway, but we probably will want to come to closure and is there a role for us.

MR. WILLARD: I think it stays in measuring and assessing.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: I think it stays in measuring and assessing until such time. What else? We have some other things here.

MR. WILLARD: Anything that has to do with copyright, we continue to say, gee whiz, it's the biggest sin in the world that a Commission that deals with libraries doesn't have the resources to do it and use it as a way to build our resources.

MS. RUSSELL: And you see that in the information document that we prepared, that it addresses that issue again as an issue that was unfunded as we put in this year's proposal.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: So we put it as mandatory unfunded. To me it's mandatory.

MR. WILLARD: Yes.

COMMISSIONER GRIFFITHS: Copyright and fair use both under mandatory unfunded?

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Yes, and distance learning.

MR. WILLARD: Now, unfortunately I didn't have the right buzzword assigned to it, but you will see that digital divide is right there. It's called "information have's, have- not's" under "backburner."

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: And that has to be moved up to at this point mandatory, I guess.

COMMISSIONER GRIFFITHS: Isn't information literacy up there?

MR. WILLARD: Well, remember, though, -- it's complicated and I wasn't at the beginning of the discussion yesterday, so I don't know how much attention went to this distinction between the simple possession of a computer, which is what "digital divide" means to too many people, versus --

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: Yes, that was made, that was made.

MR. WILLARD: We have to focus more on the information literacy. So let's just fold that information have's, have-not's into that.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Okay. Where do we go from here, oh fearless leader?

MR. WILLARD: Fearless leader? I'm a fearful follower.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Okay, fearful follower then.

(Slide.)

MR. WILLARD: Assessing.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Okay. We have under "assessing" mandatory unfunded: Paperwork Reduction Act, Title 44, and information ethics. What's going to happen, does anybody have a feel for what's going to happen with Title 44?

MS. DAVIS: It's very quiet at the moment.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Woody, do you have a crystal ball?

MR. HORTON: Not really. There will be an element in whatever we do with NTIS in the next phase, because one of the alternatives being considered would be a consolidation of those activities. But there has been no Congressional initiative to bring it all together in the legislative context.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Okay.

COMMISSIONER HIGHTOWER: May I?

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Yes.

COMMISSIONER HIGHTOWER: What it is is there is some feeling that anything that has the word "reform" attached to it is going to have to wait until after the election. This Congress is not going to reform anything. They're going to bide their time, and the next Congress is going to be the reform Congress. And it's up to us to see what that is.

MS. RUSSELL: Speak to the conclusion about NTIS, about needing to pull this into the policy and have an agenda for the next administration.

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: A little closer to the microphone.

MR. HORTON: We have consistently said in the NTIS study that we should not be looking at just the immediate narrower problem of how to reorganize NTIS per se, but how does that fit into the broader question of strengthening federal information dissemination policy in the information age.

MS. RUSSELL: And we specifically put it in the context of needing to do work now so that when there was a new administration and a new Congress we were ready with proposals for them, so that we could try to find a champion.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Payton.

MR. NEAL: At one of the NTIS meetings the minority staff director from the Senate Rules Committee, Kenny Gill, who probably is one of the most knowledgeable high-level staff people on all of Capitol Hill because she sought to educate herself and then had to educate her members and their staffs, I think, informally during a break and after that session ended she discussed how in 2001 and 2002 the Senate Democrats and she hoped the Senate Republicans, since they likely might chair that Joint Committee on Printing component that now resides in the Rules Committee, would have to readdress Title 44, but they would be doing it in the broader context of the passage of time and events and technologies.

But I think it's fair to say that it's mid-2001 before the balloon goes up again. But I suggest that when the balloon does go up again the NTIS issue, the Paperwork Reduction Act, the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, the proposal for a government-wide chief information officer, will somehow find their way, kind of meld into one big vat for -- when I say a concerted effort to do something, don't be surprised that a concerted effort is 18 months plus two years.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Thank you.

Yes, Woody.

MR. HORTON: There is one other law related to this called the Paperwork Elimination Act, which is, I think should be if it isn't, very relevant to this Commission's interests. That calls for setting goals for eliminating paper transactions and substituting electronic in the way that electronic filing has already been done with tax returns, but traversing the whole range of public information services.

That in turn leads to e-government, which we've not talked very much about and which is rapidly coming upon us. I have today a report I just downloaded from the British government from this same commission we were talking about, called "E-government, a Strategic Framework for Public Services in the Information Age." I'd like to distribute that so that you take a look at it because in many ways it looks like not an exact, but a blueprint of what could well be in for us.

They already have an e-minister, I am told, and our Secretary of Commerce is certainly leaning in that direction rapidly. So while we did talk about the digital divide, which has some heavy social and cultural, this business of e- government is rapidly moving on its own track and I think the Commission may want to consider that.

Let me give you copies of this.

COMMISSIONER GRIFFITHS: I wanted to reinforce that. The state of Michigan has just announced its putting \$22 million this year into the upgrading of its web site, so it will be able to do e-business.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: And the state of Nevada is doing the same thing, and this I think also ties into our reaching out to the Council of State Governments, which is in Louisville if I remember correctly.

MS. RUSSELL: It's in Kentucky, it's in Lexington.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: It's in Lexington. Well, I wasn't too far off. Right state, wrong county.

So does this then -- we begin to think of this as advisory? We need to really assess what work is being done by other entities that impact on some of the things that we do. So I'm not sure that this is a measuring as much as it is assessing and then recommending -- or advising, excuse me.

So what kind of verbage do you want to put under "assessing"? E-government? Okay, e-government.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: I would be in favor of that.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: It's mandatory, but at present really unfunded.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: Well, I have a question for Bob. Does unfunded mean that we could not as Commissioners ask that money be taken from one place and put into another? Or are all of the budget items in concrete?

MR. WILLARD: Oh, nothing's in concrete.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Nothing's in concrete.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: So we could do that. We could shift what is in mandatory unfunded to saying it is mandatory and it ought to be funded.

MR. WILLARD: That was sort of what I was getting at in my comments earlier about LIS for individuals with disabilities. That we've said is mandatory funded. Is it really or is it one of the things we would say no, we don't need to do any more measuring on that, we've done that, but we do need to do some work on e- government because we haven't done anything on that.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: Well then, let's ask the Commissioners that. I certainly didn't understand before that we were talking about funds. If funds are fungible, let's ask the Commissioners that question.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: I think at this point in time, when we look at some of these issues, I think this is a great opportunity for us to reach out and build on work that's being done by other entities, both government and nongovernment.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: That doesn't solve my problem.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Well, it's a means of moving in a direction.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: But then do we want to say that this is not unfunded any more? Do we want to say that this is important enough that we want to fund this?

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: Yes, you can do that if you want to.

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: I think that the question that you asked earlier about sort of what are the core things that we need to be known for is the key question. The challenge I think is that we have a small plate and a large agenda.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: I thoroughly agree with you.

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: I just got a call from the -- I don't know where it came from -- from the Under Secretary of the Navy inviting me to talk about, to come to a conference on global security and economic reform. This is a woman that barely balances her checkbook. So what's happened now is that these issues have quickly become not national issues, but global issues. This is really relevant to see what the British government's doing with e- government.

I kind of go back to the question, it's a question of what must we do, and frankly I think we must deal with disability, because I have to tell you the senior citizens of this country are dealing enormously with disability. And if everything is going to be migrated to information access, we have to talk about their ability to access information. And the boomers are going to be facing

chronic disabilities that they're not at all aware of, because the boomers thought they were Peter Pan and were going to live. They think they're 30, but they're 50.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: No, I think I'm 40.

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: So you've got to deal with the disability issue, I think.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: May I suggest at this point in time, because a lot is going to depend on what the next Congress is going to do, to say that this has to be mandatory and funded may be a little premature, because it may roll over into next year.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: You're talking about e-government and studying e-government, and when you say it would be funded what does that mean, Bob, if we said it would be funded?

MR. WILLARD: Well, here's one way to think about this. If we had a big, big chart on the wall and had every one of the action plans and then I gave you all little stickers that represented -- let's make it easy -- one staff week and I could tell you that at the professional level, because we've got four full-timers and we've got some part-time consultants, I could give you as many stickers as we have, and if you then walked around and said, okay, I want to add this, you'd end up with saying, okay, we have said e-government measuring and assessing is worth one staff week or five staff weeks in the next year.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: That's what we count on you to tell us as Commissioners. We count on you to say.

MR. WILLARD: No, on, no.

COMMISSIONER GRIFFITHS: I think, Bob, what we could do actually is, if we were to take a look at everything we've gotten, the mandates, and then prioritize them or break them, then you could figure out what it would cost to achieve that and we'd know and we could move the cutoff point appropriately.

But I think we have to see. To do it by each of the goals is difficult.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: Yes.

COMMISSIONER GRIFFITHS: Because they all are important. What we then need to say is what do we put in the mandatory categories. And we know we're going to have too many, so then the question becomes which ones are more mandatory than others.

MR. WILLARD: Yes.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: And then we're back to one to ten.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Yes, but we haven't gotten to that point yet.

MS. RUSSELL: Because we're only on goal four still.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: And we won't at this meeting. The most we can do at this meeting is highlight the mandates, whether they're funded or unfunded, and then try and take the next step. And there are some that are ongoing.

You wanted to say something, Denise?

MS. DAVIS: No.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: Do you think it would be impossible for us to have a list after luncheon of the things that have been put on mandatory?

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: That's a great idea. That's a great idea.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Yes, we should be able to do that.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: So we'll have a list after lunch?

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: As far as we get.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: I want to say one more controversial statement, I suppose. When we say nothing's going to get done until the new Congress comes in, you know, I had a conversation last week with somebody and they said: We're operating on Internet time and that means yesterday.

If we're going to be waiting -- with all due respect, if our Congress is so computer literate, they should be operating on Internet time, which means yesterday. So the fact that they may not be operating for the next four months because we're having an election, guess what. Japan's operating, Singapore is operating, Britain is operating.

So we need to kind of re-educate Congress that the cycle of time has changed in this economy and that the competitive issues around knowledge-sharing are changing and access is changing. So that's sort of a new way of thinking, I think.

I'm not saying it's all Internet time, but I'm saying the pace of things getting done is yesterday, not dog years, they call it.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Well, one of the things that we might want to think about -- and lord knows I've discussed this with Bob -- and that is doing a position paper highlighting a number of these issues and getting it in the hands of the policy advisors to both the presidential candidates.

But there's no reason why we can't take this further and bring it down to the senatorial races and the House of Representatives races.

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: I think that's right. There's a thing that's done in Wired Magazine that's called "This is Tired, This is Wired." We don't want certain things to end up on the "This is Tired" list. We need them to be on the "This is Wired" column.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: I have to say I feel both tired and wired, but I agree with you, and that's a damn good point. If we are an advisory policy body, there is nothing that we have in our legislation -- we have in our legislation the ability to go to people who are running for office and say: These are significant issues, you should be addressing them. Then we become very proactive.

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: It's a personal struggle for me because I look at, where can I add value with the ideas and knowledge of the baby boomers, senior citizens, the new economy and the venture economy, and is my job to renew my Commission role or is my job to find another commission where I can be impactful, or is my job to say to six Congressmen, you need to wake up the Congress about the pace and cadence of the new economy and the sense of urgency people are seeing, because it's not about the new economy, it's about the libraries that can't wait, the kids that can't wait, and the seniors that can't wait, because those services go by and it's not okay that some librarians are there until 10:00 at night.

We need to wake them up to the connection that they could take as leaders.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Denise.

MS. DAVIS: That's exactly why Bill Gates did what he did by giving equipment to libraries, because government was not doing that and he saw an opportunity to make a contribution.

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: Just for the record, Belinda Gates was very much the inspiration for that.

MS. DAVIS: But it's his money.

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: We're talking about institutions that on one half of the Capitol will agree not to do anything if one person wants to think about it.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Beth, you need to go.

MS. BINGHAM: I can hear everybody else. To follow up, go back to --

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: No, no. You've got to use that.

MS. BINGHAM: I'm sorry.

To go back to the Congressional situation and the Congressional candidates and whatever, well then, the next step is to go to brief the new people that come on board, because we always concentrate on the powerful people. We never concentrate on the new people, the new kids on

the block that need to find out what the issues are, because they're only hearing what they were supposed to hear.

This is where this Commission could be extremely effective taking the new message to the new people, because these people are going to be important one day maybe.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Are you saying then that this should be a very high priority, because it's not going to cost an awful lot of money and I'm not sure it's going to cost -- it's going to cost staff time, but how much staff time?

MR. WILLARD: That is the principal money we have. That's two-thirds of our budget is staff time.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: I know, but is it going to take a week of a staff person or two staff people?

MR. WILLARD: Yes.

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Yes.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: I would like to say that my idea of how to handle things -- and maybe nobody will agree with me -- the way we did NTIS, it came up --

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: And we did it.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: We did it. We got the thing out. Why could this be done and these other things have to be put off?

MR. WILLARD: Because we stopped doing things to do NTIS.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: But that's not the end of the world. That's what the Commissioners are here for, is to encourage the office to come to us and say this opportunity is here. The NTIS was done as well as anything since the last five years I've been on this Commission.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: With the exception of the "Kids and the Internet."

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: With the exception of --

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: The "Kids and the Internet."

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: Well, there was a long hiatus. I mean, the pamphlet took forever and everything else took forever. But the NTIS is done for the moment.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: True, okay.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: That's the model I'm asking for.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: For the time being.

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: I support your comments. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Okay, so at this point policy advice on issues to candidates goes under advisory as mandatory?

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: I would absolutely agree with that. I think that's a splendid idea and I think we ought to do it.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Okay.

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: I would say, while it's wonderful to have the publication, there's a lot of publications, as you know from curriculum, that ended up on the shelf. It's the communications plan that will ultimately assess the impact of this.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: We are down then now to under assessing. We have five minutes. Desirable, unfunded?

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: I know STI is not Star Wars, but I don't remember what it is.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Scientific and technical information.

MR. WILLARD: Scientific and technical information.

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: Is that the journal?

MR. WILLARD: No, that's NTIS.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: That's NTIS.

MR. WILLARD: The precursor of NTIS. It was another example of our prescience.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Now, in terms of postal rates and policy, that's an issue really that is handled by the American Library Association. We certainly, as we did last time when we were faced with this issue, we did send - we did communicate with the U.S. Postmaster and his sidekick, who is, believe it or not, a kissing cousin by the name of Sidney Schulins, in terms of the impact on libraries, and they did scale back some of the problem.

So if this comes up again, I think just a communication to support whatever we feel we need to support might be worthwhile.

Yes.

MS. DAVIS: I would suggest that you replace "postal rates and policy" with the notion of taxation of access to the Internet.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: Oh, yes indeed.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: That's a very good point.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: Oh, that is.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: We thought it was going to go away.

MS. DAVIS: We thought it was going to, but it's not. And libraries are significantly impacted by that and if they will remain the core of the access to electronic information they're going to get whacked big time.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: Could we push that over to desirable?

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Well, we may have to move it up.

MS. DAVIS: We may be able to roll it into literacy and the big picture of what the impact is.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Okay.

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: I think on the postal rates and policy, to the extent that it involves blind and other disabled people we have a much stronger mandate than generally.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: They have never done anything about doing away with that.

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: No, but if they ever did we would have a higher level of concern.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: But right now they are looking at the nonprofits and the book rate. We were able to pretty much forestall them the last time. Who knows what will happen this time, because with the new administration, even though the post office is not really a federal agency per se, it's an independent federal agency. I've never quite understood what the hell goes on with the post office. All I know is it takes five days for a letter from Sparks to get to my house in Reno, which is three miles.

So where are we? We're going to look at the taxation of Internet. Let's put that up under mandatory unfunded on goal three.

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: On that issue, I think there's an awful lot of confusion that I shared in for a long time. If you charge somebody sales tax for a purchase that they make on the

Internet, that is not taxing the Internet. That is a state taxation issue. And we may have the same position on it, but taxing the Internet per se is not that.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: There is the other issue that I can never remember.

MR. WILLARD: May I respond? I think that is exactly what that is. The moratorium that Congress passed specifically disallowed any sales taxation.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: He agrees with you.

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: No, I'm agreeing with you, but that is not the only issue. There are also people who want to tax the use of the Internet. They want to have a tax on the house level. And it's easy to confuse the two.

I have a different position on sales tax for purchases made on the Internet than I do on taxing the use of the Internet.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: We're talking about, my understanding, we're talking about taxing on the use of the Internet.

MS. DAVIS: Libraries are impacted both ways. They buy books through Amazon.com for their libraries and they're tax exempt for the moment. That needs to be extended into the e-commerce model for libraries.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Right.

MS. DAVIS: The second piece, however, is the telecommunications infrastructure being taxed for moving information around. Right now aggregators, publishers, and so on are lobbying against that. But since they provide commercial service as well as the not-for-profits and libraries fall into it, it's a tough argument for them to make.

They'll go back to libraries if they end up having to pay the tax. Libraries are going to pay one way or another. So there are lots of issues.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: There is another issue and it has to do with purchasing software. I've gone blank, Bob. Do you know what I'm talking about, the shrink wrap and the licensing issue?

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: I think this is a really important point. Women.com, Ivillage, and Oxygen touch maybe 100 million women each week as an aggregator. Do the women that go there, would they want taxation for certain services to be allocated to social benefit? Interesting question.

Why is the Hunger site one of the top nominees as a Webbie this year? It's because people go to the Hunger site for that. So my question is, for me what does the audience think about these issues? Because we have to reflect who our constituencies are.

So would older people be interested in having a percentage of that done? I think we could do questionnaires of our audience or we could poll our audience to find out how do they feel about these issues, because I don't know which way they'd go. I don't know whether they'd want the liberty of this or whether they'd want the social benefit of it. It's an interesting question, I think.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: It is now noon and we are just moving up to goal number four and we have nine goals. What is the pleasure of this group?

MS. RUSSELL: Do you want to let people get their sandwiches and bring them back to the table?

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: Have lunch and bring it in?

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Let's go ahead and get our lunch and we'll have a working lunch. You can eat.

MR. WILLARD: Why don't we take a break.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: All right, why don't we take a half hour break.

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: Or maybe 45 minutes, because you've got to get some materials back to us.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: All right, then we'll just go ahead and take a lunch break. Lunch is right outside. We're going to break for lunch. Yes, we'll take the full hour because I think we're all on information overload right now.

(Whereupon, at 11:57 a.m., the meeting was recessed, to reconvene the same day.)

AFTERNOON SESSION

(12:59 p.m.)

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: We are back in session. What I would like to do -- not what I would like to do. What we are going to do, we're going to take the next half hour to continue working on the plan and then what we will do is, the Commissioners who feel very strongly about some of the issues, get the information to Bob. Bob and staff will reorganize this, send it out to everybody, and then you will get back to Bob your priorities, your prioritization, and then we'll pull it all together.

We cannot formally take action today because, unfortunately, we do not have a quorum. I'm not sure when we will formally meet again as a Commission. I am hoping that as soon as Bobby is confirmed, Joan is okay and can vote until July.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: Until July 19th.

Jose wants to say something.

COMMISSIONER GRIFFITHS: Martha, couldn't we go ahead and talk about priorities now, rather than go through each one, because I think this is seamless.

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: I think that's a good suggestion.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: I think that's a good idea.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: So do you want to talk about priorities? Then we will talk about priorities.

COMMISSIONER GRIFFITHS: Let me start it off, then. It seems to me that what we discussed this morning, there seems to be some leaning towards the fact that we must do something with young children, the next generation, if you like, focusing on them first because they're the future.

So issues of school libraries, issues of literacy and information literacy, how to address children with disabilities, the digital divide. So focusing on the next generation it seems to me, if we're going to do anything, should be one of the priorities.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Okay.

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: A second priority I think is the identification of the key policy questions related to the new economy and the education of Congress around our constituents' perspective on those issues.

COMMISSIONER GRIFFITHS: Congress and other decisionmakers.

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: And other policymakers. So that we are able to say, here are the five core issues that you need to have a point of view on, here are some sources of information that can help inform you about those issues, here's why those issues are important to the constituency that you serve, and here's the amount of time, something about there's a certain time urgency in understanding these issues because of global competitiveness.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: I would like to say that one of my top issues is certainly the Internet and taxation because I think that may impinge more upon what actually happens in the country at the ground, where the states say that they're not going to have the money to keep up roads, schools, libraries, fire equipment, or anything else if all commerce is untaxed.

It seems to me that's an extraordinarily important thing.

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: I think that's right, Joan, and I think that our point of view about what do the constituents that we represent think about that is really important.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Bobby, you really have said very little today.

MR. ROBERTS: I'm a non-voting member.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Well, we can't vote anyhow. You can give us direction. You must have some concerns.

MR. ROBERTS: I suspect it would be that the Commission, just to take one issue and that's the Internet, which a lot of this seems to, digital information, a lot of this seems to revolve around, is we don't have a clear position, or I don't in my own mind, on what the Commission's kind of overarching position is on the Internet.

Let me give you an example. It seems to me that, getting beneath all the discussions that are going on, there are really two issues here. That is how much of the Internet is a public utility and therefore is subject to regulation and universal access and taxing and funding and other things, and how much of it is proprietary.

It seems to me that, because of our very charge, because of the very law that we're here to represent all people, then our position ought to be that the Internet is a public utility and therefore you need to look at what we advise on. I think that's the main thing to do.

Frankly, I think we're more reactive than we probably should be in planning. So that may be why I haven't said much. It seems to me that you need some overarching statement on that issue, how the Commission sees the Internet, that is is it a public utility, and therefore when questions come up about taxation then you look at it in terms of a public utility.

I guess the two examples I would give you would be in transportation. If you look at the railroad system, that's a proprietary system. The railroad owns the track, the railroad owns the good and services that run down it. The highway system is a public utility which everybody can use. And what kind of model do you want?

Where we have tried to run a public utility on a proprietary system -- Amtrak would be a good example -- it has not worked very well. It seems to me that that's the overarching question, so that when we ask Bob to respond to a bill that's before Congress he can say, how do we see this, and then we respond to it in that way, which means we might be opposed to a lot of open codes versus closed codes, for example, if that comes up. And that could come up in the future.

I don't think we've ever had any real statement of overarching position.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: No, we haven't.

MR. ROBERTS: Without that, I'm not sure how you decide what you're going to focus on. That's just on the Internet. That's not talking about what to me is an equal issue. Most of this has been talking about the Internet. An equal issue is simply access to traditional materials, which is still by and large what libraries are doing and are going to do, at least in the near future.

So I think we need some attention paid so that the staff has some way to say this is what the Commission believes about its function to serve and protect the public interest, and that might put us and would put us in conflict ultimately with business or put us in conflict with the American Library Association.

I don't mean conflict in a bad way, but in disagreement somehow. So I'm not sure how you do any of this in any organized way if we don't have a clear statement. And if we've gone one, I'd like to get it written down, because I have not seen what it is, for example.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Woody, do you want to talk into the microphone.

MR. HORTON: I'm reacting to what Mary said.

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: Wireless mike.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: We could dedicate one wireless mike to --

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Just keep it over there.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: Yes, that's what I'm suggesting.

MR. HORTON: I guess what I'm doing is reacting to what Mary said, and I'm not sure she intended what I'm going to say. But I wouldn't cast all of this under just the heading of the information economy.

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: Right.

MR. HORTON: It's the information society that is also being transformed. So it is true that the nature of the economy is being transformed, where information and knowledge are becoming

sort of the strategic transforming resource, as some have said, as opposed to wealth and agriculture in the traditional industrial and agriculture age.

But the way the information -- the way the society is being transformed into an information society carries with it non-economic issues, if you will, which are equally important to the economic issues.

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: I with pleasure accept that editing. You're absolutely right about that.

Bobby, could you clarify what you mean by how a public utility fits into a global society? That's a word I don't understand.

MR. ROBERTS: I'm certainly not an expert on the Internet, but the Internet -- I probably don't need this; this will be just fine. But the Internet started out as a public utility and it was created specifically by the government with governmental dollars, and it's functioned as a public utility for a long time.

But it's clearly becoming more and more commercialized, and when it does it becomes more and more proprietary in what's running across it. What I see happening to it right now is you've got a group, a business that would like to see it have all the advantages of a public utility, and that is its taxpayers and in other ways, but they don't want to have it regulated.

Well, in truth it's been regulated all along. So you have this, I think, this debate going on about how much of the Internet really is a public utility, that is open to the public, subject to public regulation, regulated for the public good, and how much of it is going to be proprietary. In other words, how many Amtraks are you going to run down the proprietary side of it, or if it's a public utility how many commercial buses are you going to run on the highway and trucking systems?

That's to me the decision that all of these things about taxes and all of this revolves around, is how much of that mix. I don't think it's an either-or or what kind of mix do you want, but it would be hard for me to tell the staff: Okay, we've got a bill before the Congress; what's our overarching policy on what the Internet could be, and then how does this bill impact the people?

It seems like, unless the law was changed, the way I read the law in my simpleminded way, it is that purpose of the Commission is to protect the interests of the people, which makes it inherently slanted toward being a public utility, because if it's not a public utility it's proprietary and then it's managed by a different set of circumstances.

It seems like you have to recognize at the beginning that the law says we're to look out for the interests of the public and that goes to the heart of the Internet being a public utility just like the telephones were. So what you have -- let me just finish. What you have, for example, going with the cable companies, you have cable companies that will want to and will probably succeed in being able to determine who your Internet providers is going to be.

Well, that's a proprietary function that they're doing. So some countries are it seems to me moving in the direction of the Internet being a public utility exclusively. I just think that's what the debate is going to be in Congress and where we need to figure out where we are on that issue.

I don't know where I am on it. I'm not saying that -- but it does seem like the Commission, because of the federal legislation, if it's there to protect the interests of the people, then it has to look at the Internet as a public utility.

MR. HORTON: Closely related to what Bobby was just saying, for the past year UNESCO has been advancing the concept of what they call a civil society. Now, unfortunately that term has some semantic problems with the American English and perhaps with British English, because the adjective doesn't quite modify the noun in the way other people would like to see it.

But I think the idea goes in part to one of the things that Bobby was saying, that what UNESCO is really doing if you read the fine print is that they are reassessing the traditional values which have been given to the main players in a society -- government, the private sector, the institutions -- and in their view they think they are coming out with a more enlightened, a more fair, and a more equitable redistribution of power under their civil society.

So I guess my bottom line is we might want to look more closely at that concept and see if we want to buy into it or are there any parts of it that we think we could translate and make use of in our country?

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Bob and then Joan.

MR. WILLARD: This is just a quick reaction, and I appreciate the fact that Bobby says he doesn't know where he is on it, and I think we all have questions. But I immediately think to myself, well, we all are very much concerned with library and information services, so we think that's pretty high. But there's a couple of other human needs that are even higher. For example, one is food.

Yet we're not talking about developing a public utility for food. We do have -- what's the old phrase -- safety nets, mechanisms to take care of people who don't have food, but we still rely on a competitive marketplace for the delivery of that service.

There are certainly cases where, and they're becoming less and less true, where natural monopolies do exist. We used to think that in terms of wiring, but anybody who's lived through the digging up of the streets in Washington knows that there's many people who are able to put wires up to facilities, for better or for worse.

So I just want to make sure we don't jump to saying that the public utility is the approach, because I think many arguments can be made for the benefits that we've seen from competition in the provision of carriage, communications carriage.

MR. ROBERTS: I would say that the Microsoft rule is a good case in point about this public utility. It seems to me that's what that ruling is all about. I mean, basically if you agree with

Microsoft's position or not, they're saying this is a monopolistic practice and if you're going to operate in this public utility then you're going to have to share some of this information.

That seems to me the direction that the federal government may go in on this. I don't know.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Woody? Who wanted to make a comment?

MR. HORTON: No.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Joan.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: I'd like to say two things. One, in this discussion that we're having now following up on what we had before luncheon, I think any suggestion ought to be specific so that Bob knows what he has to produce for the Commission.

If we want a statement on this we have to know how we're going to get that. We can't just say in a vacuum we would like to have a statement. If we really want a statement to go out to the Commissioners and be going over and over and over and back and forth, then that's what we want.

But I would also like to say that one big section is keeping track of international things. We talked about -- so far, would somebody like to summarize? You have been writing, Martha, the things that we have mentioned. I'd like to put in the international field because we have Woody with us to brief us. He's marvelous, I increase tell you that. He is wonderful at this kind of thing.

So we have an international field. We have --

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: We have the senior disabled, we have the next generation, which is information literacy, digital divide, school libraries, sort of all interactive. We have the issue of NTIS. Certainly we're going to be monitoring what's going to happen with Title 44, library education, assessing -- no, we're not measuring -- assessing on e-government.

We have it down here as assessing mandatory, but as yet unfunded, Paperwork Reduction Act, Title 44, information ethics, and e-government. I mean, all kinds of notes. Bob is keeping the nice notes.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: But does that fulfil what Jose just asked for?

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: We talked about briefing policymakers, and what did you say?

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: Children.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Well, I've already mentioned that, the next generation.

Then we have some statistical things that are going to be ongoing, and we're starting the next Internet 2000 study.

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: It seems to me what Bobby has said about -- I'm grateful for the way you posed the question because I think when we look at it it is enlightening to learn that people in libraries bought books from Amazon. So on the one hand, I think on this mix of where do we stand in terms of a citizen's point of view around public utility, public utility plus mix with commerce commerce.

I think many citizens that I know find a lot of value in things like WebMD and DrKoop.com and those resources. So they wouldn't want it all turned over to NIH. I think that they would want to see some of those things.

But that mix and the sliding scale of that mix is an important issue for us to give direction about, I think.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: How would that direction look?

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: I don't know exactly. I'd say it should be -- I think it might depend on the different constituencies, Joan, that we represent. I could sort of speak what I think aging boomers and seniors might think about it, because I just have a familiarity with their perspectives on some of these things. But I'd want to go get more research done.

But if you answer that question, then it's easier to answer the question about taxation, because unless you know to what extent it's public-private or private only or public only it's hard to say what percent should be regulated. I think we have to provide that. I think we have to be very specific.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: If we only talk about this here, we haven't done a thing.

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: No, I agree with you we should make recommendations around that.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: And that's what I'm asking, what is the recommendation? How many things did Jose ask for? How many things were you looking for, Jose?

COMMISSIONER GRIFFITHS: I don't know, a handful.

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: Right.

COMMISSIONER GRIFFITHS: That's all we can thoroughly cover.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Also I'd like to bring up an issue that arose out of yesterday's informal discussion and that was one of the issues that Joey Roger put on the table when she talked about something equivalent to the Good Housekeeping Seal of Approval of an entity that

would evaluate sites, because one of the big issues that has been brought up time and time again is what on the Internet is good.

I'm not talking about pornography. I'm talking about the validity of information. How do you know there isn't a dog at the other end?

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: Are we capable of it?

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: I'm not saying - - not the Commission, not the Commission. But that is an issue that Joey brought up, and I think no one here has addressed content and I think that that's a very serious issue.

But on the other hand, I'm not sure there's anything we can do about it. But that also falls into the realm of information literacy, being able to help people evaluate the information that they receive on the Internet. That I think is a real issue for libraries.

COMMISSIONER HIGHTOWER: Martha, you get involved with the First Amendment there when you talk about content.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: You bet we are.

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: But I think Joey yesterday was suggesting an entity that would recommend, not censor.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: Not censor.

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: I don't think there's a First Amendment issue in recommending certain sites for certain purposes for certain people. I don't think it's something I want to get involved in, but --

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: But she wasn't talking about recommending. She was just talking about validating that the information on XYZ site is good information.

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: It sounds like a recommendation to me.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: Well, let me say that the Good Housekeeping Seal of Approval came up before we had a litigious society. I'm not sure you could have that kind of thing now, you could start it without having legal cases from here to California.

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: It seems to me if you went back to Bobby's anchoring question, you could incorporate what you just suggested, Martha, because if you had a sense of what the mix was -- and I will just throw out that I'm a fan for really understanding what this e-government thing is in Britain and with making sure that much of this is accessible as a public utility.

But I'm a fan of a mix between commercial or private and public uses of the Internet. I think we would be not able to say -- I know that seniors go all over the Internet for lots of things -- books, greeting cards, all sorts of things -- and I would not want them not to be able to do that, and to encourage that kind of activity.

MR. ROBERTS: Let me give you an example of where I think something like that would be useful, some of the tax policy on the Internet. To me, if you look at the commercial activity on the Internet, that's not a public utility issue. The issue that Amazon.com sells over the Internet and they compete with Barnes and Noble and places is a good thing.

The question of whether or not you want to have me pay a sales tax or the library pay a sales tax or not is an issue of tax fairness to me and in a sense falls outside the purview of the charge of this Commission.

If you look at what Abe talked about a minute ago about whether or not you're going to tax phone lines and Internet services and create a universal service fund so that the have-not's who have to use the public library are going to be funded as we've always funded universal service on the phone system, that is a legitimate avenue of inquiry for NCLIS if we are committed to the idea that we're here to make sure people have access to information.

Then that tax issue to me is germane to our charge. I'm not sure the sales tax issue really is. But in my own opinion it's a matter of tax fairness and we ought to tax them, but that's me talking. It has nothing to do with information. If there wasn't a dime of information that went across the Internet and it was all goods and commodities that are moving, I'd say tax them as a matter of tax fairness. But that's a different issue.

So it seems to me you need some just overarching position, principle, that you stand for on that Internet, and then you try to look at the law that's been proposed or the study you're going to do and say this is why we're doing it.

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: Well, I think that's right. And Joan's point about the touchstone points in terms of the state economies, I think I saw a shift in some service categories, 38 percent to the Internet. So what happens to the tax base in that state that funds libraries or schools from that issue? That is a core issue right now.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: We have five minutes and then we're going to have to go on with the rest of our work. So we have identified the issues that we talked about this morning.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: Have we done a prioritization?

MR. WILLARD: No, we're nowhere near it.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: We're nowhere near doing a prioritization, nowhere near.

MR. WILLARD: But we've come a long way, and in some ways I think we may have made a big circle, and let me test that. Because if you go to page 8 of the annual report, we try to keep in front of everybody the action plan that was adopted in Little Rock.

That only has, when you actually get through it, it goes goals, objectives, and then actions. There are only a few actions and they are writ -- well, the goals certainly are writ broadly. I think that was what Jose was getting at in terms of if we put something that said issues dealing with young children and then start putting under it, it's a different approach than what I introduced this morning, but it's just a different approach.

One of the things I did during lunch was put this sort of schematic together --

(Slide.)

-- which takes those steps that we talked about and puts them in a flow, because it really is a flow. I could imagine if you just thought of that as a graphic and took, let's just say, one of our -- forget the word "goals" for this for just a second and just think of it as a graphic.

One of our goals is to be worried about -- we can come up with better words, but be worried about issues dealing with young children. Then under that you list five or six subpoints, for lack of categorizing it right now, and for each of those subpoints you use this graphic, but highlight where we are in it.

So for example, if it was on kids and the Internet the measuring, assessing, is pretty much done. It's in the advising and reporting. Now, we may think that there's additional research and development we need to do. Maybe we had -- we won't do this, I know, but suppose we let a contract out with a filtering company to improve their filtering capabilities. That's when we have a \$10 million or \$100 million budget. So we'd be down in the R and D.

But I would be glad to sort of take what we have talked about so far and try to come together with the five or six overarching -- I don't know what the word is for it yet -- and put the subcategories and say, because I do want to safeguard our linkage between what we're doing and what the law says we should be doing.

But it doesn't have to be lockstep with the schematic I laid out this morning. I think we're getting to something when we talk in terms of -- and again, it's probably a lot easier to deal with a legislator and say, we're concerned about young children and we're concerned because of Internet, we're concerned about the digital divide, we're concerned about, and we also are sensitive to the international overlay on many of these issues.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: I would agree with that. I think this is a very good schematic drawing. What are the five or six things that you --

MR. WILLARD: Well, so far what I wrote down is issues dealing with young children, identifying key policy issues in the information economy, society, and educating policymakers

on them, Internet taxation, Internet as a public utility versus a commercial proprietary type network, access to traditional materials and information content.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: And also international. International ought to be down there.

MS. RUSSELL: And kids are just one special population. We have Native Americans, elderly.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: But at least we're identifying a number of issues. We have reauthorization of LSTA. We have the obligation under law to advise IMLS, and we really have to - - there are some legal things we have to do no matter what.

COMMISSIONER GRIFFITHS: One of the things that I was trying to get at in suggesting that we look at priorities is the fact that, while we were dealing with it from a process perspective, which is what you've now put into the graphic, we kept putting too much. Everything can't appear in every one of those boxes. That was the concern and it seemed then to be overwhelming.

What we want to be able to do, I think, or what you want to be able to do is to answer the question: If for some reason our funding were cut and we could only do one thing, what would we choose to do? That's priority number one. And if we could actually manage to do two things, what would be the second thing we'd do?

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: That is correct.

COMMISSIONER GRIFFITHS: And what kind of impact would we want to have? So these items we would do for whatever we pick, but that was what I was trying to get at this, what's the topic or what's the subject of what we're going to pick that we're going to measure and assess and so on? You don't want a lot of those. As I said, a handful is it.

MS. RUSSELL: What the law says, but what we've never done except for one stab many, many years ago, the law says the primary thing we're to do is to have an overall plan. Obviously, you can't do an overall plan if you don't have the pieces to assemble into the plan.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Which is what we're trying to do now.

MS. RUSSELL: But what the law says is that that is the number one objective, is to get to the plan.

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: And I don't think it's fair to Bob for us to leave without saying in our concerted opinion for those people in the room, here are the two things that we would want to hold you accountable for a year from now, that we did execute flawlessly on those two things.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: Like the NTIS.

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: Yes, like the NTIS. So I don't think it's -- with all due respect to the agenda of the day, I think that we don't want to minimize the need to be very clear and focused on the one and two, three possibly, things that we would want to have brought back.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Well, I would like to put this on the table for your discussion, because we have to narrow it down. To me the most important would be briefing the policymakers both in and outside of government, because that is the major responsibility of the Commission. And I don't remember how you have it written down here.

COMMISSIONER GRIFFITHS: Martha, Martha. When I was making notes, I actually put together both what Bobby was suggesting, which is rethink about a statement or our view of what this is, the Internet or whatever we decide to take on, and then fold in right after that. So that's a statement, and then you come up with the issues, the pressing issues.

The purpose of doing this is in fact to inform policymakers at all levels of government and industry and so on.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: That is correct. The law says we're supposed to be doing it, and that really gets back to highlighting issues that will have to be addressed, not only at the national level, but at the state and the local level, and those issues involve access to information, that's the taxation issue, and of course the other big overwhelming one, and you and I agree on that, and that is what are we doing for the next generation?

Under that comes the digital divide, information literacy.

MR. WILLARD: Young children, next generation issues.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Okay, then young children.

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: And Rebecca had some really nice insights to follow that she shared at the break.

COMMISSIONER BINGHAM: At the break I said that when we look at service to older people and younger people we have to remember that there are going to be three levels of older people very soon. We have -- there are going to be three levels of older people pretty soon.

We're talking about the baby boomers who are going to be coming in, but there are those who are middle old and there's a burgeoning group of the old old and they are active. No, I'm talking about the people in their nineties who are still mentally alert and active.

When we talk about service to seniors, we have to remember that it's these three groups and we ought to be ahead of the car makers, who have now started making swivel front seats because some of the baby boomers are needing to get in and out of the cars, and the rest of us had to get in and out of the cars the best we could all along.

But I think this is really, really linked with our service to our young people, because I think that we are going to soon have a larger percentage of our population older people. Look what's happening to too many of our young adults. Look what AIDS is doing to us, look what violence is doing, decimating a group that has normally been the large earning group.

And we have the high tekkies, but then we have a lot of people that are not going to be making those kinds of salaries, and we're going to have these needs to be served.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: And interestingly enough -- and where did I read it? I cannot recall. But if we are not at zero population growth, we are very close to it, not only in this country but in the western industrial nations, and that, you know, in the long run has enormous impact on society.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: I want to ask Bob and Judy if this is enough or --

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Have we overwhelmed you?

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: No, quite the opposite. We're not trying to overwhelm. We're trying to get down, if I understand the conversation properly, we're trying to get down, trying to get down the number of things.

MR. WILLARD: We haven't done that yet, but give us a shot.

MS. RUSSELL: What we'd like to do is get something together and give you something back to look at and react to.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Woody had something he wanted to say.

MR. HORTON: The flow of issues and concerns that is now surrounding the Internet and the information age is virtually endless and I think will continue to be endless. I guess what I'd like to put sort of on the record for this discussion is that there is one litmus test which I personally use which the Commission might find useful in trying to decide whether one of those issues and concerns is something worth our while, i.e., should be on our priority list.

What I'm trying to do is to turn this into a model which is a more dynamic way of looking at how to deal with the problem rather than a static. The kind of litmus test or guideline that I personally use is to ask myself, how is this development going to empower individuals to do for themselves what they could not otherwise do just as well were we not living in an information age, and then juxtapose that against the context of our mission and our goals.

There will be issues and concerns which are very worthwhile, for which there are many stakeholders and players, that are going to be fought in many arenas, in Congress, in associations, and in other places, but which do not fit our model or our context even though it's a worthwhile issue.

So it's just that kind of a little reality check as we go about the prioritizing and ways to help people use knowledge resources to better cope with their personal challenges, to help them with their social challenges, especially all the disadvantaged and disabled groups that we have talked about, is one approach to that.

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: What if we just asked each Commission to say what are their top two things? Then we can just get those down for the record and you have that to work with? So if we just went around the room and said, here are my top two, here are my top two, and then we move on, top two issues we'd want you to focus on this year?

COMMISSIONER HIGHTOWER: May I?

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Yes.

COMMISSIONER HIGHTOWER: I think what Bob suggested earlier was that they were going to prepare a paper on all of this and we could take that and take it sitting here rather cold.

MR. WILLARD: How about e-mail me the top two things within the next week?

COMMISSIONER HIGHTOWER: I'd rather have all the information on all of them that they can compile and put together for our consideration, rather than just say right now.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: I think at this point I'm going to make an executive decision and I am going to say we have a lot of information on the table. It needs to be sorted through and pulled together by staff. We will send it back out to all of you.

If your top issues are not there -- but I suspect they will be -- then get back to us, and hopefully we will pull it together. When you look at what Bob and staff pull together and send back, think about what he said because I think that's germane, and also go back and look what our action plan is and how does that fit into what we've done in the past.

Also, remember what is currently in the pipeline. And we have the template (indicating). Do not forget the template because that's still valid. So with that, you have your homework when you go home and we will go on to the next item on the agenda.

How's that for being executive?

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: Okay. Nobody would quarrel with that.

DISCUSSION, NCLIS

THIRTIETH ANNIVERSARY CELEBRATION

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: We will now discuss the thirtieth anniversary celebration, if indeed we are going to have a thirtieth anniversary celebration. I would like, if we are going to do that, that be something very substantive. I can't even talk at this point.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: What are our ideas? What are we thinking of?

MR. WILLARD: Let's just do a little scene-setting first. July 20th, 1970, is when the Commission came into existence. It wasn't one of the action steps, but somehow I found just a little bit of time for it anyhow. I looked up a little bit of the legislative history of getting this place going -- very instructive, and I hope some day to bring it together and make it in presentable fashion. I guess Joan and Martha have received copies of some of the floor debate that took place at the beginning, and it's very instructive stuff.

I also looked to see who was around supporting the Commission at that time, who actually put their names on the legislation to start the Commission, and to a lesser extent who voted for it. It was pretty much unanimous. The only people who voted against it were the people who traditionally vote against new government enterprises.

We can with very little effort generate a list of all the members of Congress who supported that legislation who are still with us. We do know which members of Congress who supported it are still in the Congress. That's only three, but on the Senate side it's very important: It's the Chairman of the Appropriations Committee and the ranking minority member of the Health Committee, Ted Stevens and Ted Kennedy.

On the House side it's a member of Congress who left for a while and came back, and that's Patsy Mink from Hawaii.

So at the very least, I think we would want to consider some sort of activity that recognized their contributions 30 years ago. But I think also, something about human beings that love numbers that end in zero and five, and you can use them as pegs for observing or recognizing. We could have a symposium on a topic.

I don't want to monopolize. I think the purpose of this time slot is simply to get ideas from other people.

COMMISSIONER BINGHAM: You know, it might be interesting if we had some of those where you have spoken to so many organizations and others have spoken who really did not know we existed or really what we did, and this is what I experienced when I spoke to the music libraries. It was quite interesting. They were really interested, and their interpretation of copyright covered so many aspects that we don't normally think of.

If we could just ask some representative from some of those groups, it might perpetuate our linkage to those people who have received inputs from us over the years.

(Pause.)

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Don't everybody speak at once.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: I would be in favor of a symposium, but I'm an academic. In my family they say: Oh, you always want to hold a symposium.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Well, you know, we have identified some very substantial issues, and bringing in entities from other areas in a symposium to address some of these issues I think would be a really great way to celebrate the thirtieth.

COMMISSIONER HIGHTOWER: While we're all in the mode of looking forward, why don't we have a symposium on the next 30 years?

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: I think it's a great idea.

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: I think that's a brilliant suggestion, and it will be really interesting to do. What my concern about events are, they were precious moments yesterday when we heard those four inspiring librarians tell their story. My only concern was it didn't go to a national audience on television, it was not written up in USA Today, and all 585 --

MS. RUSSELL: They didn't even record it.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: They didn't record it?

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: No.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: Well then, how about writing to all of these people and asking for those speeches?

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: So here's a kind of California thought -- and pretty soon I'll be out of here and you all will find some other Californian with their crazy thoughts. But in California, after companies have IPO's they have all these people who are disappointed they didn't get in in the friends and family round.

So I think what we need is sort of a friends and family of NCLIS event, and in the event we invite all the constituencies to come to the symposium to look at the next 30 years. We ask the 100 year old person, you know, that's really terrific to talk. We ask the nine year old child that's trading on E-Bay to talk. We ask Ted Kennedy to say a few words.

Then we get -- this is the California part -- a rock star or a celebrity that cares about reading and libraries -- and whether that's Harrison Ford or Paul Newman or whoever's picture is in the NCLIS office, which I always find inspiring. We ask them to come and sing or talk or do something, because people tend to like to go to celebrity events.

Then we give back in some way and we say that the proceeds of this event, whatever money is raised as a result, is going to fund the poorest library or is going to fund the next generation of

librarians, and we invite ten members of the venture capital community to talk about how they're going to be giving in the future, and then we get a global perspective.

So we really orchestrate it as an event and we hold it either in the Senate where they all come at lunchtime or we hold it in the White House where people like to go, in the Rose Garden.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: Well, we've been trying to get RCLIS into the White House. It's a harder job than you think.

MR. WILLARD: Not impossible.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: But not impossible.

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: Well, I think if you had the right celebrity that said they were willing to sing at lunch, they might want to come.

MR. WILLARD: There's no such thing as a bad idea when you're brainstorming.

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: Well, Harrison Ford at lunch, with Tina Turner talking or singing, or Herby Hancock, who I know would do this, I think, Herby Hancock talking about black children, and LeVar Burton, let him come and help with this.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: It would be nice to see him.

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: I would call him. One of us should call LeVar and say: Here, we're going to do 30 years of celebration.

Your idea of looking at the future is brilliant. You've got to do it through music. You've got to do it through a way that they're going to come and pay attention. Otherwise we risk having a symposium with precious ideas and wonderful pearls and great treasures, like we had yesterday, with not enough people there to hear the voices. I think that that's what we want to do.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Including, sadly, the library press.

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: Or Winston should have been there.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: There was no one there from Library Journal. There was no one there from American Libraries.

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: We always miss things.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: Who should have been there?

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: Winston.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: He was there.

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: Oh, I didn't see him. Oh, I didn't see him. I'm sorry.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Jim was there.

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: Jim Billington was there.

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: But the point is to honor these treasures everybody should want to come and see them, and we need to create enough surroundings that we can say that these are the people that make enough difference in America, these four librarians, pay attention to what they're saying.

Everyone should want to be there, like at the Academy Awards. I looked at the Academy Awards, I looked at the Webbie Awards, and I looked at the Librarian Awards, and I thought we should be dressing -- not dressing, but we should be there to honor these heroes, just like our teachers.

The event could give us an occasion to do that. I think Tipper or Hillary or Bill, they'll get behind it.

A California idea.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: We have some good ideas on the table.

Yes, Jack.

COMMISSIONER HIGHTOWER: I think one of the reasons why we didn't have a better crowd last night, everybody had been to a reception where you stand around for an hour and you stand around and hear some presentations. You're going to have to program it.

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: Right.

COMMISSIONER HIGHTOWER: Set it up in an auditorium and announce the program and print it out and circulate it, and then make it -- what was it we went to over at --

MS. RUSSELL: The Digital Divide Forum at Commerce?

COMMISSIONER HIGHTOWER: No, the one over at the DAR Center when we saw the presentation by the President of those awards.

MR. WILLARD: The Humanities and the Arts Awards.

COMMISSIONER HIGHTOWER: Yes, the Humanities Awards. That was programmed, it was set up, and we had entertainment.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: 20 people worked on it.

COMMISSIONER HIGHTOWER: People wanted to come. You needed to have a ticket to come. That makes a difference. But if you say we're going to have a reception, we'll have some punch and cookies and you can stand around and visit for a while and then we're going to let you watch us present some plaques, hey, you're not going to have a crowd.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: This goes I think to something that is ongoing, and that's our interaction with IMLS as the advisory entity, because we had very little input into how the whole awards thing was set up. I think next year we have to be a little more proactive and interactive with them.

COMMISSIONER HIGHTOWER: We're talking about something for us that we're going to do, and we want to put it up on the top shelf.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: That's absolutely right. You're talking about the awards ceremony and I'm saying next year we've got to do better. But if we're going to have a thirtieth anniversary thing, then it has to be a hoop-de- doo, I agree.

COMMISSIONER HIGHTOWER: Do you suppose you could get some of your jillionaire computer people out there that are kind of interested in doing this and write us a little check?

COMMISSIONER GRIFFITHS: If we make the topic related to that, then they will come.

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: It's really important, I think -- my favorite new book is "Respect" by Sarah Lawrence Lightfoot. It's really important, the people that have -- like Herbie Hancock, he'll do anything globally, because he's an older person and he cares desperately about children.

So the answer isn't would they come and would they write a check. The answer is would they come because they believe this is an efficacious group to advance an agenda that they care about, which are children. And I think that what we have to do is identify the people that care about children and invite them to something that's special, that it's invitation only, and know that the people that are there are going to be actively listening to their ideas about a platform for that.

Then I think you can inform people, and once that happens they'll write a check for anything. It's the passion that they care about and the sense that you care about the same things that they do. That's what I think.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: If we're talking about the future, would we want to say this is children in the future?

COMMISSIONER HIGHTOWER: Well, let's talk about the divide. We've had a lot of talk about the digital divide. Where do we divide it? The past 30 years, the next 30 years. This is our dividing point.

Now, we're going to celebrate what we've done, where we've come from. We want to talk about where we're going. And if you and your company are interested in helping in the direction of these things, help us set this up. And maybe we can get some money if we do it that way.

MR. WILLARD: It should be remembered that the meeting that the Commerce Secretary convened on the digital divide was just an absolute sell-out. People showed up, and there hasn't been any --

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: I think if a hundred people felt that they were -- I don't think any more there's single authorship for anything. I think only great things happen with shared authorship. I think that under the notion of shared authorship and celebration it isn't so much -- it's you cared about this in the past, would you help build the platform in the future.

Bobby said an inspiring thing last night: It's never great unless you sacrifice a little bit. So could you find a hundred people that cared about this to come and celebrate the future and to help invest in being an architect of that future?

If they really felt you cared about that, I think they'd come. I think what people don't like to do is be invited and give a check ex post facto. People will give amazingly if they can be part of that in the future.

COMMISSIONER GRIFFITHS: If your theme is digital divide and united future, you're going to get people to buy in, to say we're going to work together for the future, to create an architecture for the future.

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: "United future" is a beautiful statement.

COMMISSIONER HIGHTOWER: We have a first class citizen in Austin named Michael Dell.

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: Right.

COMMISSIONER HIGHTOWER: Michael Dell has been very, very generous to Austin things, and I've been looking for some reason to go knock on his door and introduce himself. You know, I just want to rub shoulders with him a little bit.

I think that we ought to be able to make a presentation to somebody like Michael Dell.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Absolutely.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: But we've got to get the presentation ready.

COMMISSIONER HIGHTOWER: But it's got to be a first class real.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: That's it. It's got to be a first class deal before we go.

COMMISSIONER HIGHTOWER: That's right.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: And we do have --

COMMISSIONER HIGHTOWER: And we've got to know what we're asking for specifically.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: It's also true that we have some positive buildings in Washington. We have the Kennedy Center, we have sites. We have sites in Washington that are meaningful to the nation.

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: Joan, you know that more than anyone, probably. What sites do you think would be --

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: The White House, the Kennedy Center are the two biggest.

MS. VLACH: The Library of Congress.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: The what?

MS. VLACH: The Library of Congress.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: No, that's different, that's different. That's for the library community. We are not talking about the library community. That's not what we're talking about.

MR. ROBERTS: Bob, what time frame are you looking at?

MR. WILLARD: Well, the nice thing about -- just like the Millennium gets to be observed for two solid years, the pattern that we used for the 25th anniversary was to recognize that the Commission was started on July 20th, '70, but the first meeting didn't take place until some time in '71. So we used that full year period as the commemoration period.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: I struck out with Coca-Cola on sister libraries, but I would sure be willing to go back and ask Coca-Cola about this.

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: You know, Joan, you sort of inspired me with your statement about the two places. Here's a way of thinking about this. The IMLS -- one of the new IMLS Commissioners is also on the board of the Thelonius Monk --

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: What?

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: One of the Commissioners on the Museum Services Board --

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Florence?

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: Right. He's a wonderful man. He's on the board of the Thelonius Monk Junior Jazz Learning Institute. So he connects with all the musicians connected to that, Herbie Hancock, you know, Bill Evans and all those groups who teach jazz for kids.

It seems to me if you could do something like have an insider's tour of the White House, if you could have -- from one of our museum counterparts, if you could have jazz with Thelonius Monk or the groups there, and then you could have a special event where Michael Dell did come and Larry Ellison did come and Steve Case did come and those six librarians came and Ted Kennedy came, and it became by invitation only and you structured the conversations with some of those leaders, it would be really an exciting moment.

It would have to have a co-host in the President or the Vice President, I think, to really make it work. I think that if we put some of the elements together, we have enough people around the table that know people that they could bring an evening together in.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Jack, and then I think, Jose, did you want to say something?

COMMISSIONER HIGHTOWER: We had at one time, when I was in Congress, we had a group that I was part of called the Futures Caucus. There are organizations that are concerned about the future, and I think we could hook them into it, too, because they need to be concerned about the future, where we're going with the digital divide. To get them involved, I think it would be good.

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: That's a great idea. Paul Sappho would be great. Paul Sappho would be able to pull this off.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: The other thing is, if we're going to go in that direction I think we should have a rap group. I just have this great visual vision of a rap group really talking about all of this. Isn't there one group called Iceberg or Ice Cube?

MS. DAVIS: Ice-T.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Ice-T. I wasn't too far off. I knew that "Ice" was in there somewhere.

COMMISSIONER HIGHTOWER: John Naisbitt, he wrote "Megatrends," which really started a lot of the futurism.

COMMISSIONER GRIFFITHS: He was a librarian.

COMMISSIONER HIGHTOWER: Yes. And I guess he's still around, isn't he?

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Oh, yes, and so is Toffler.

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: If you put a panel together where you've got Toffler and Naisbitt and you've got Jeff Bezos from Amazon and one of the librarians that was there yesterday, it becomes a pretty interesting mixed group to talk about that.

COMMISSIONER HIGHTOWER: That would be a great symposium.

COMMISSIONER GRIFFITHS: You know, the National Academy have just gone through the exercise of bringing in some of the key IT people, like John Sealy Brown and Vince Cerf and so on. What they've been doing in thinking -- the National Academy is thinking about the university of the future, but what they did was they brought these people in to talk about the state of technology as these people would envision it for the year 2030, which is close to what we're looking for.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Exactly.

COMMISSIONER GRIFFITHS: So it might be that we could also get one of the key people from the National Academy study to come in and also present that.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Also, San Jose State University's Graduate School of Library and Information Science is in the process of creating a virtual graduate school and it's going to be all done on the Internet and with distance ed. I think that would be very fascinating.

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: It would seem if you had a steering committee that understood the futures perspective, well, how to do this in Washington, as well as the thought leadership, because what's happened now, this group that you just talked about that they're bringing in, all the major corporations are now bringing them in, too, because I'm on the -- there's only two women or four women, so I get invited. After they've had six men they say, oh, we need a woman, and then they bring one of the Girl Geeks in.

So Girl Geeks could be a sponsoring group. Those are the sort of the leading women - -

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: There's a group called "Girl Geeks"?

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: You should be part of that, Martha. Really, we should have -- we should have this -- this should be disseminated through Girl Geeks, because Girl Geeks are the most influential women on the web. So you want to reach women that are women leaders in new media, they would care about this issue because they're all members.

So you kind of have to go to where they are.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: How do you reach "Girl Geeks"?

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: I will introduce you. Trust me, they will have you on - - that will be your first interview. They'll be all over this topic. They will care a lot about this.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: We've had three people who have given us some good things to think about -- Jose, Mary, and Jack. Would you like to be the subcommittee to pull this together?

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: Well, my concern is that I may not be on the Commission after July. But I'm glad to act as --

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: Are you on your final year?

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: She's on her transition year.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: Oh, you're on your transition year. So you came on before I did.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: You know, there's no reason why former Commissioners can't be involved. I mean, just because you are no longer going to be an acting Commissioner, there's no reason why you can't do something to help us.

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: I'm glad to be on the steering committee between now and July. After July I don't know what my new commitments are going to be. I'm trying to discern what to stay connected to.

COMMISSIONER GRIFFITHS: I think we need Joan on.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: I don't know anything about the future.

COMMISSIONER GRIFFITHS: You know the Washington scene, though.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: What I know about the Washington scene, though, is where to hold it, that's it.

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: No, you know a lot about how things are done.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: I have not been successful in these kinds of things. I have not.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Oh, come on.

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: You know what a symposium is.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: I found out how different the embassies were in those days, and I found out how much of a difference it was to get the White House to work with.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: As the Vice Chairman she will be involved anyhow. But we have to have someone here on the committee who is willing to. Certainly I am willing to work on this with anyone.

Jose, do you want to be involved?

COMMISSIONER GRIFFITHS: I'll do it.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Jack?

COMMISSIONER HIGHTOWER: Yes, I'd be happy to.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Okay.

COMMISSIONER HIGHTOWER: But let me add that I think it's critical to have someone like Mary because we want someone who knows who these people are.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: She mentioned 16 people I never heard of.

COMMISSIONER HIGHTOWER: Yes, that's it. We need to identify these people. But my guess is, and this is just strictly a guess, that everybody in the computer industry is trying to out-think everyone else as to where to go next. They don't want to be the second one in line. They don't want to be the Apple. They want to be first in line.

So I think this is something that will really grab their attention and we can get excited about.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Certainly Joan as the Vice Chair and myself as Chair will be involved. We automatically are on these things.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: I'll go to Coca-Cola. I'm happy to go.

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: You need to teach us how to do things like this in Washington, though, Joan.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: I'm going to hand out some assignments. You're going to give us a list.

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: Can we have a chair for the committee? Could Jack chair it maybe?

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Do you want to chair the committee, Jack?

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: And then we'll have the meetings --

COMMISSIONER HIGHTOWER: Then we can have meetings in Austin. I think that's great. Austin brags about being the Silicon Valley of the South.

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: Let me just say why, because it's one thing for me to go see these people and they say: Oh, yeah, there she is with yet another idea. It's another thing to say: We have a former Congressman leading this committee, who's dressed in business casual -- I'll send you an e-mail about that -- and he's going to go around.

And you go speak with Mort Meyerson in Texas and Dallas. He's my digital mentor. He will tell you everybody around to go talk to. By the time this happens, the credibility will come in part from you being the head of the committee.

COMMISSIONER HIGHTOWER: That's fine. I'll be happy to do this.

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: Because everyone thinks Congress is not listening to the new media community.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Remember that we have to have a program outline before we start going out. The first thing is to pull a program together.

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: You know how to get in touch with Jose and Mary and myself and Joan. We can have a conference call.

COMMISSIONER HIGHTOWER: And we can do a lot with e-mail.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: And with e-mail.

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: I also think it's important -- one of the things Bobby said that inspired me earlier when we were talking about priorities is that there are still books in libraries. You know, I've actually gone back to books. I'm moving out of the Internet back into books.

I think it's important that this be a celebration of books as well as the new media economy. It would be great to have Bobby's point of view on that, too. So if you would maybe be an ex officio member of the committee, I think that would help a lot.

MR. ROBERTS: I'm a person with their feet in the past.

COMMISSIONER GRIFFITHS: Book publishing and book sales are going up.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Yes, and people keep telling me that use of libraries is going down. Well, it may be going down someplace, but certainly not in Reno, Nevada.

MS. DAVIS: Visits are up, circulation is down.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Even our circulation was up.

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: As important as the agenda is, the most important thing we need to have is the location and the date, and it needs to be far enough time away that we can say: Mark your calendar for October 5th in Washington.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: 2002 is what you're going to be working on, if not 2003.

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: Well, actually I think we should have a committee that says who are our best inroads into scheduling something at the White House.

MS. RUSSELL: You can't schedule anything until after the election because you don't know who you're scheduling with. You've got a window until December with this White House.

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: I think we could work both angles on that. But we need to have a date.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: Speak to you later.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: This is not -- we are now getting into the committee do's and don't's. That's your job. So we're going to end this now. The idea is digital divide and united future, and I will leave it up to the three of you to come back to Joan and myself with a concrete outline and we'll take it from there.

NCLIS COMMITTEE/PROGRAM/PROJECTS UPDATE:

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: We are actually getting down to committee, program, and projects update, and Chairperson Gould has something on the Executive Committee. The Executive Committee really hasn't met recently, but I've made some executive decisions.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: Good.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: One of the things I have done is I've asked Bobby if he will please take the bylaws that we built on what you originally did -- and we have it on disk, do we not? We'll give you the disk and ask you to complete looking at it, run it by Bob because he had some concerns, and at some point when we finally have a quorum we will be able to put our bylaws into existence.

I would like to tell you what I forgot to tell you earlier, that I did do a short five-minute greetings at the Public Library Association meeting. Where was that? Charlotte, the airport that has rocking chairs.

Come on in, Emily. You have a seat at the table. Well, she's somewhere.

At PLA I was interviewed by John Berry from Library Journal, and I am somewhat stunned. I will be on the cover of Library Journal.

(Applause.)

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: And the young man who did the photographic shoot, when he talked to me on the phone I said to him: I take a terrible photograph, so be sure and bring a silk stocking. And he actually knew what I was talking about. Back in the days of black and white photography, in order not to have lines, because they didn't have air brushes, you photographed people through a real silk stocking.

Anyhow, I would like very much also, and Rosalie and I have talked about that, making sure that when various Commissioners go to various conferences that we actually are on the agenda to bring greetings and update on the activities of the Commission.

I was also informed by Sarah Long that they are going to host our breakfast at ALA in Chicago and they are going to be inviting the heads of the divisions and of other library associations, because it appears that I am the first public librarian to ever be named as Chair of the Commission.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: Also, if people go someplace could we have reports. You wrote a wonderful report, Rebecca.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Yes, absolutely.

I have a report coming from your trip to Europe.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: It's on there.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Is it on there?

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: Yes, it is. I try to do it in a week, but I have a secretary and that's a big difference. I understand, but if within two weeks of what people went on money from the Commission.

COMMISSIONER HIGHTOWER: We could say, Joan, that every travel voucher should be accompanied by a report.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: That is our policy.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: That is the policy.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: It is the policy.

So with that, we will go down to the next item on the projects update, and that is Sister Libraries.

SISTER LIBRARIES,

A WHITE HOUSE MILLENNIUM COUNCIL PROJECT

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: Well, it's nice to report -- Beth, do you want to get up? It's nice to report on such a success. Beth was on for the first nine-tenths of it. Do you want to start?

There is a success story coming.

MS. BINGHAM: I reported in Los Angeles that Rosalie's been brought on to be in charge of the project, and she and I worked on the report together, it was yesterday and today, with Joan. Really, when we got the agenda and saw that we were on it to give a report, immediately we said, well, really very little has happened, and then all of a sudden we started going back and found out that there has been quite a bit of activity.

If you didn't notice the Sister Libraries booth as you walked into the new offices, you're blind, of limited vision to see. The booth went to the Public Library Association meeting, and I want you all to be so proud that Martha and Rosalie are quick studies at getting it up and getting the material out and working the booth.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: And Rosalie remembered to bring a stool, because we are short.

MS. BINGHAM: We are all short.

I think that the most amazing thing was the amazement at Rosalie and Martha of the people that came by, that asked so many questions and were so excited and interested in the project. It just made everybody feel very, very good about the project.

We had lunch with Maggie Hite from the World Library Partnership in Charlotte to learn about them and to see how they could work with Sister Libraries. There were even libraries in Zimbabwe and they are interested in expanding their assistance network of funding, staffing, equipment, all the things that we don't have any resources to give to them. But there was some substantive conversation and Martha indicated to them that the Commission would probably be interested in facilitating a meeting in D.C. to bring their issues to the table for stakeholders that could perhaps provide assistance for this particular project.

We are constantly looking for a home or a place to put Sister Libraries at the conclusion of the Millennium Project. After our discussion, we pretty much felt that this would not be a recommended home site because it's not really set up to take on this particular project. They're too much of a struggling entity themselves.

Librarians from selected and designated libraries came by in droves to tell us about their activities, and when they would walk in when somebody else would be in the booth they would

start talking and they would start selling the project for us, and that was kind of exciting, to see the electricity that was going on.

There have been some wonderful opportunities from library directors talking about how they have been able to use this project to generate enthusiasm and energy and funding resources for their library, for their children's people, and to do some collaborative partnering to get exchanges of staff.

The librarian from Norman, Oklahoma, came by and she has had her children's librarian go to Mexico and she will be going on the next trip with Rotary International. This is another partner that we found out about, that Rotary International is very interested in funding exchanges of people.

Jack Buhlow came by from Birmingham and said that he was just thrilled. He had been able to go to Japan a number of years ago, but now that they have paired with Naples he's getting to go to Naples and the mayor is now energized again about the international relationship and reputation of the Birmingham Public Library. So this is something for the credibility that the Sister Libraries White House Millennium Council Project is doing.

Another librarian had been to Italy for two weeks, a nice little junket to go and see how things are done. Gary Strong, last night we recounted that one of his sister libraries, he had actually had a staff exchange before they were selected, so they have an ongoing partnership and he is sending librarians to Croatia.

So as I say, it is really interesting to see how each library is making their own connection.

Clara Bohrer from West Millingfield, Michigan, came by and said that after they finally found a partner, after we'd been through seven different councils and embassies and everybody in Japan that we could find that attended IFLA, they finally have a partner and things are great. They are so excited and the children are doing a lot of things.

I have pages of people that have done things just since we met in Los Angeles in February. Virginia Beach has brought on another partner. A gentleman that I met at Sister Cities International last summer from Northern Ireland was so excited about seeing the booth and seeing that Virginia Beach was doing things with a library in Japan that he went home and he persuaded the council of which he was the chair to take on a partnership.

So they came to us with a ready-made partner and established a sister city relationship after they saw the project, because they saw a library they wanted to pair with. So I think that that's kind of interesting.

El Paso Public Library and Juarez Public Library have this huge agenda. They've been working together for 30 years to get some type of connection. The Sister Libraries White House Millennium Project is the credibility that they needed to get things finally working. So I think that this partnership and collaborative effort is really exciting.

Someone that Joan met on the way back from Bangkok last summer attended the Carmel School in Hong Kong, so she got them to send in an application. I just got an e-mail from Jeffersonville, Indiana, their partner, that they have been working very closely together with the Carmel School and they have each planted trees in each community to recognize the partnership.

It's real interesting that the Hong Kong community sent \$30 to Jeffersonville, Indiana, so they could buy the tree. So I think that this is another thing. But all because Joan was willing to get out there and talk about the project.

The other thing is that they have the children -- we're talking about children and youth and that was the focus of the project to begin with. In Jeffersonville, Indiana, they had a poster contest to write posters about their community and the little boy won, and they said that the poster that won would go to Hong Kong.

The little boy said: Oh, I'm going to Hong Kong. And the other students beat him over the head and said: No, you're not; your poster's going. He said: The picture is supposed to reflect me; I am going to Hong Kong.

So this is kind of empowering, to see what's going on.

I'm doing another consulting project with a university in Monterey and they took information about the project and they're advertising and publicizing. Another friend of mine is an architect who's traveling in Russia right now and she's looking for Russian sites.

We've opened the third application cycle and we have broken the mold. We're looking for any type of library and any type of project. It does not necessarily focus on children and youth. May 1st is our deadline. We've advertised on seven library listservs and had over 50 hits so far of requests, and I have a huge stack today.

The only thing I wanted to pass around was, Tijuana and San Diego were one of our first selected sites and I've told you all along about how exciting it was to have a committed community that pulled together, a whole community working together around a table, public, school, academic libraries, to talk about a project and to do something together.

They pulled together the same network in Tijuana. Their project was to focus on children writing about themselves or their lives and to produce a book with pictures. They have taken it a step further. Their Spanish classes have translated the material into Spanish. On the other side of the border, the people in Tijuana have done the same thing for English.

This is one of the samples (indicating). This is from a middle school. And it is truly making a difference. The people in Tijuana have computers, but they don't have accessibility to inexpensive telecommunications.

The business strip on the main drag in Tijuana, after hearing about the project and hearing about the selection and designation, took up a collection and wired every school in Tijuana so that they

could participate in this project. And it's simply because it was part of the White House Millennium Project sponsored by the U.S. National Commission on Libraries.

A group will be going to Sister Cities International in Denver. We're working that out. Rosalie is taking that charge over to make sure everything happens, that we can present the plaques for round two and round three.

If you're going to be at ALA, mark your calendar for July the 8th from 3:30 to 4:30. We will have a tea for the participants, and hopefully the Commissioners can come because it's really an interesting opportunity for networking opportunities.

Everyone that's participated in the project says that the one thing that they really would like to have is to have an ongoing communication channel. So a listserv is something that we have thrown out. But it all comes back to the fact that we're looking for a home. It is a Millennium project. Rosalie is now in charge.

The International Relations Committee has contacted the Commission to see about having a part in a program in Chicago, and I believe Joan is going to do that.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: There's something I don't understand. Why did we start a third go-round? I thought we were going to talk about that.

MS. BINGHAM: As I say, I was instructed to get information out.

MS. VLACH: This is the completion of a round that was already in progress.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: And how many do we have in that round?

MS. BINGHAM: We so far have 50 requests for applications.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: How many are we planning on having?

MS. BINGHAM: That decision has not been made. We'll make that when the materials have come in. I've already had three responses.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: No, no. I mean how many are we going to decide we're going to take? Are we going to take only those people that already have a partner, for instance?

MS. BINGHAM: I think that those are things that we'll have to get together and decide and examine very carefully, because one of the things I did have to stop Martha and Rosalie in Charlotte from doing -- a number of people came up and said: Oh, we're already doing this type of project informally. And they were saying: Oh, that's fine; well, you can become a partner. I said 42 times 4, 42 dollars times 4 is the price of the plaques. And they quit saying that right away.

This is a funding situation. We have to go back to the drawing board. But I believe - - we did not make any determinations on the number of libraries that would be selected during the process. We have selected 98 cities in the United States so far and we are still lacking partners for about 8 communities.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: That's exactly what -- you see, my fear is that we will never evaluate this if we keep on going until the last minute with getting libraries and everybody's excited and everybody is having a good time. Part of this is the evaluation.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: And the evaluation will take time. And I would love to see it and as soon as possible, so we can start on an evaluation process, because we started before the Millennium.

MS. BINGHAM: The information has been sent out to round one and round two of the selected libraries asking for information from them so that we -- and we're getting information back from them so that we can structure an evaluation process.

Every library that has been selected knows that they will have to fill out an evaluation, they will have to give us ongoing information so that we can examine what has to be done.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: See, I don't think for a minute we're going to get those without chasing them. We'll get some. There are some that are always responsible when the others are not and we will get some. But my fear is that the evaluation, which to me is as important as doing it --

MS. BINGHAM: Well, that was part of the design of the project, and that made the difference of other twinning projects that are out there in that there was going to be an ongoing follow-up to find out what had happened, how much staff time it took, how much it actually cost the library to participate, was it worth it, what did they get from it, and was there a connection that they could make that was an ongoing connection with city government.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: Yes, yes.

MS. BINGHAM: And then a final report.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: A final report.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: Then perhaps Rosalie could talk to us now.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Okay, Rosalie.

MS. VLACH: What we have already done is -- or at least I should say, on our schedule is to send out the evaluation forms and begin that process, because we can't leave that until the end.

MS. BINGHAM: Right.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: I have a question. Is it my understanding then as of May 1st we will close down the applications?

MS. VLACH: Applications, yes.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: Okay.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Then you will look at the applications and make the decision and that will be the final group.

MS. VLACH: Unless another decision is made, that's right.

MR. WILLARD: That's a separate decision.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: That's a what?

MR. WILLARD: A separate decision

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: A separate decision.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: How?

MR. WILLARD: We had pledged that this was a Millennium project. The Millennium goes until December of 2001.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: But it is if the evaluation is part of this.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: We have to do the evaluation, then, and that's going to take time.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: Yes. So if we say May 1st is the last time that anybody can apply and then we start the evaluation process and the evaluation runs until December, we will have fulfilled our mandate and we will have a successful effort.

MR. WILLARD: Well, that's good to know because, as you know, I have dragged my feet, not for any reason other than simply bandwidth, time availability, in raising money from a commercial provider. I certainly won't go back to that commercial provider --

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: No, I wouldn't.

MR. WILLARD: -- and ask for any more money, even though they wanted to give it to us, if the 150 is all we're going to do.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: No, no. Well, it may not be 150. If we close it on May 1st and we don't have another 50, we will do 120, 130, however many we have.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: I think the problem that we're looking at here, and I'm going to throw this on the table, is that we have only so much staff time and only so much staff ability. If we want to prolong the project, which after being at PLA I have to tell you I got very enthusiastic about the Sister City Project - - but we can't do it unless we have money to bring on some extra help.

MS. VLACH: But what we have to decide, I think, then is are we going to continue. if we are, then we ask for the money.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: Continue on what way?

MS. VLACH: With the whole process. That brings into the question where will we send the booth?

MR. WILLARD: We certainly aren't going to go to IFLA this year.

MS. VLACH: Right, that's my point. These are decisions we have to make, and I thought we were going to discuss this.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: The point would be that does it cost money to do the evaluation that we don't have at the moment?

MS. VLACH: Well, it will cost staff time.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: But does that mean collecting more money?

MS. VLACH: I'm not sure.

MR. WILLARD: We are not going to collect money from any commercial vendor to promote themselves within 104 libraries. They are looking at the 100,000 libraries in the country and saying, we'll get as many as we can.

MS. VLACH: I also would like to make a point that I became aware of when we were in Charlotte, and that is it is exceptional advertisement for the Commission. I had a number of people come up to me and say: We are so happy that the federal government is doing something like this, because they know we are here and they are finally taking an interest.

So I don't think we should forget that as well.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: What's the feeling, the reaction of other members of the Commission? Bobby?

MR. ROBERTS: I don't have -- I haven't thought about it, to be honest with you. I'm curious about the money issue that Bob was talking about and any private support to keep it going.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: But if it's a Millennium project, how long do we keep it going?

MR. ROBERTS: Well, as long as you can get some value out of it, I guess. I'm not hung up on the word "Millennium." Nobody knows what that is anyway.

COMMISSIONER HIGHTOWER: It's another thousand years.

MR. ROBERTS: It's still a useful word, you're right.

I hadn't really given it much thought. I don't know what impact it's been on the staff. It certainly seems to me that the dividends that it's paid out in terms of publicity have been excellent, and whether or not there's a way to continue it past where it is or not I think will depend, Bob, on frankly what your willingness to commit to it is and where the money might come from.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: I was truly stunned at PLA because I went to PLA feeling that the third round really should be the last round and then we have the final year to put together the evaluations and write the report. The thing that really amazed me, we didn't give away anything and people came to the booth. You know, usually when you give away something people come to a booth.

People came to the booth. They would be walking down --

MS. BINGHAM: There was standing room. Sometimes the three of us were all working with people and there were people waiting to come in to talk to us, and that was amazing.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: I felt totally stunned.

MS. BINGHAM: Some of our guests were doing a lot of selling for us simultaneously.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: But I have a real concern about the impact on staff and the money, because at some point we have to make a decision. Rosalie is handling Sister Libraries, but her most important responsibilities are the legislation and communications, and unless we have the money to carry this through to the end of the Millennium, whenever that is -- I think it's 2001, depending on whose calendar you follow -- I have a real concern because, as good a program as this is -- and Beth, you know, did a hell of a job pulling this together --

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: I think so, too.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: The bottom line is staff resources and money and what are the priorities that we need to face.

Bobby.

MR. ROBERTS: Bob, do you think there is some way to get private money to do it? I mean, it has a track record. I guess that would be my question.

MR. WILLARD: If we are going to continue it, if we are going to continue to give people the opportunity to participate.

MR. ROBERTS: I would love to know what you want to do at some point. I mean, I really, really hate for us to make what looks to me to be an uninformed decision. It wouldn't be the first time I've made an uninformed decision, but it certainly would be one.

I'd really like to know -- I don't mean right now, but at some point -- what you think could be done and what the possibilities are. I think we'd be better equipped to make a decision.

MR. WILLARD: Well, one of the things that I reported on very briefly this morning was the interaction with UNESCO. When I talked to UNESCO the one program that they really see as important, and it actually correlates to their UNAW.

MR. HORTON: UNAW, UNESCO Network of Associated Libraries.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: They certainly weren't hopeful at that luncheon, because we mentioned it.

MR. HORTON: The State Department has criticized NCLIS indirectly for not having more direct relationships with UNESCO, and this indeed is one area where you could consider doing that.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: Well, I'm worried about it.

MR. HORTON: It's the one area where they are, where the State Department has singled it out as supporting the USECA funding.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: I'm worried about it because I think that to do it successfully we have to have the evaluation. I think 150 or even 120, 130, is what we can do. Now, I've been accused of having too small an appetite. I'd rather do it well with less than go on and get a whole lot and keep on going and then find out that we don't have a proper evaluation because the evaluation is as helpful as anything else.

I would say to UNESCO, look, if you think it's great let somebody else take it on. I don't think we have to be the people to keep it on because I don't think we have the staff time, and I think it's time -- well, I would be more than happy with May 1st.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: On the other hand, if, as Woody has pointed out, and certainly I heard that from some of the people that I talked to at the State Department when we had that meeting here, they're interested in seeing things continue, if we have access to USECA money that can be used for this -- and that may mean that we'll get more USECA money.

MR. HORTON: Yes. Joan, I don't think those two ideas need be mutually exclusive. I think you can decide to go ahead with the evaluatory component, but at the same time announce your

intention to make the transition of the project to UNESCO and give them a copy of the evaluatory component.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: I would be very happy if we stop it at May 1st.

MR. HORTON: I think they'd be very willing to take it.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: I would be happy with that. I think that would be fine. Then UNESCO runs it.

MR. HORTON: We should get money this year from the State Department to help, yes.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: To do the evaluation. We don't have money at the moment to do the evaluation.

MR. HORTON: That's where the money should come from, then.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: And then we do the evaluation. I would be more than happy with that arrangement. And we say that May 1st is the deciding point?

MS. VLACH: It's the latest and I guess it sounds like final round.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: Bob has some comments.

MR. WILLARD: It's like the politician said, declare victory in Vietnam and leave. That's what we're doing and that's fine. As I said many times, I gave up my vote on this body two years ago.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Yes, Jack.

COMMISSIONER HIGHTOWER: I think all projects have a cyclical life and you don't want to cut something off before it reaches its top, but you don't want to stay with it after it starts going down. So I don't know whether May 1st is the right date or January 1st next year. I think it's all right to set a date. Certainly we've got to press through to get these evaluations.

MR. WILLARD: This is to reset a date.

COMMISSIONER HIGHTOWER: It would be all right to reset it if it still has a surge, if it's still moving forward. But if it's already kind of peaked, why, then that's the time to say we're going to bail out.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Before we actually make a decision as to whether it's going to go to UNESCO or what we're going to do, we can finish this round?

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: And get, you know, the next group of libraries up and running.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Then go to the evaluation process. Once we see what has happened with the evaluations and it really is successful, then we look to how we're going to carry it on. At that point we can work with UNESCO. We may be able to have -- we will have concrete information that will allow us to look for additional funding, and it may be that we will continue it on within the umbrella of the Commission.

We may do a partnership with UNESCO, who knows. But I think at this point we will have enough libraries involved to be able to do an evaluation.

Abe.

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: I'm obviously missing part of the point here, but -- and I don't have a Ph.D., so I don't understand a lot of things. But I don't see any value in spending any money on evaluation of this project. We went into it because we assumed the value of it. We've seen the value of it. It's piggybacking on other kinds of Sister City projects, which most of us have had some involvement with.

If we evaluate it, is that for the purpose of having it replicated somewhere else? We are a replication of Sister City type projects. Or are we doing it to justify the funding that we've spent? I think we went into this because we were sure it was going to be valuable, and I'm not sure what kind of -- and I may be overstating the way I feel a little, but I'm not sure what kind of data we expect to get.

I mean, is anybody going to say, it was a bad idea and I wish we hadn't done it?

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: No, no.

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: Is this so that we can have another Sister City project at the next Millennium? I see no value in spending any money evaluating it. I'm willing to ride on the assumption that it was worthwhile, everybody enjoyed it and benefited.

MS. RUSSELL: I think the problem is with the word "evaluation." What we talked about doing is pull together, much like the four stories we heard last night, the success stories and putting together a publication which identified all the libraries that participated, so they got a little bit more permanent glory in the form of a publication, but which also took the success stories and the innovative ideas and by putting them in a publication we captured the value and made it reach more people than it would simply by reaching the 150 or however many it turns out to be libraries that would participate.

So I think "evaluation" is coloring it. What we were talking about was documenting of the successes and highlighting some of the wonderful things that these libraries have done, particularly for children.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: And also pointing out some of the difficulties and how they were addressed, so that libraries who wished to develop a Sister Library project will understand better a process for doing it.

Yes, Rebecca.

COMMISSIONER BINGHAM: It seems to me that we have reached a point where we could very well close off, because we do not have these annual meetings or these sectional meetings of ALA every year. We've had the two major sections that are involved with this Sister Cities. We've had the Public Library National Conference, we've had the AAL National Conference, and the booth was well attended at AASL.

This seems like a very good time for us to do just what Judy just said and bring it to some kind of closure, because we want to stop while we have momentum and something to impress people with. I'm afraid if we go much beyond having a report at the end of the Millennium we will wear people out.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Mary.

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: Let me suggest that sometimes we use the word "publication" with the notion that people are going to read the publication, commit that publication to memory, and be inspired by it and change the world. And as someone who's written seven books which have gone out of publication and never reached a large number of people, I don't really view publications any more as a way to reach a mass audience in the way I used to, although I'm trying to finish a new book. So I keep failing in the right direction, I suppose.

What I do think is important is if we can combine the last discussion of so we had a symposium and it was about digital divide, united future, and you could take the core elements about the Sister Libraries program and you could disseminate to 100 influential people in the room at the White House or the Kennedy Center, whichever place we choose or chooses us, with people who we think in the audience can make a difference.

What are the elements of that program that you would want to share? What are some of the visions of that future program? Many of us one day, God forbid, are going to lose a sister. I think I lost one and all of us feel a little emotional about the sister we lost that we're going to be thinking of tomorrow.

In her memory, I'd like to think that there could be a million sister projects and that we could inspire lots of people to give to them. So that there may be a different way of thinking about the sisters project that reaches a lot of people.

Just like we are hoping to endow a library in Illinois, I'd like to think that everyone in the memory of their sister or in the memory of their brother, but especially a sister, that we said a million sisters were represented and those sisters are represented in Bali and in Mali and, God help us, in Kosovo, and that we took that idea, that germ of an idea, and we said to those 100 policy leaders and thinkers, and Michael Dell after Jack educates him, that, yes, you can make a

difference, and all those people in Dell that want to make a difference, they can give to this sisters project, because I think the Simon sister project might be an inspiration for all.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: I'd just like to say how much time goes into one of these Sister Libraries projects: trying to get the money together for the plaques, trying to get people together to go to the tea, trying to get word out, trying to get -- there is a hidden amount of work here that sometimes doesn't float up to the surface.

It's not even just talking back and forth to these people. It's also the rest of it, and contacting their government, which I think is a great idea. I didn't have it. I thought it was a great idea that we also work with the cities themselves.

So I would be very happy with that suggestion about that we go at least to May 1st.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Bobby.

MR. ROBERTS: What I hear from Both and others is the you've got people lining up wanting to join something and our answer to it is to quit doing it when we're a low profile agency looking for some way to stay visible. I have a little trouble understanding why we want to do that.

There may be good reasons for it, which is why I would still like to hear from Bob at some time about is this something that we want to continue to do, and if so where do we get the money? But that's a fair question to ask to the Commission.

It seems to me if you're looking for something that the private sector might be interested in supporting for a while, you don't have to do what you're getting ready to do with the 30-year anniversary. You've got to go out and create something that doesn't exist, to try to convince somebody to fund something, when in fact you have something that you've got a track record on and you've got people who want to participate in it.

I hate to throw it over. I work for a board and my sort of authoritarian view about how things work is that the director comes to us with proposals about what he or she wants to see happen and then we look at those, not the other way around, that you're having to deal with 14 different people with 37 different ideas about what they ought to do.

I'd rather see it come up to us, and this is particularly when I'd like to hear from the staff with some reasoned thought about it. And I'm not talking about telling me now, but say this is what my considered professional opinion is about whether or not to continue this, rather than us trying to give you advice on that. I just think that's improper for what I see my role as a Commissioner as, frankly.

I'm really concerned about cutting off something that seems to be working when we've had so few things that we've been able to get much publicity out of. If we want to cut it off, fine. But I'm not willing to think at this point we ought to do that.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Woody.

MR. HORTON: The reason UNESCO is interested in this project is not because they want to take over a quick turnkey activity for public relations value. It's because they already know through what we have told them that among the lessons learned from the experience we had under the heading White House Millennium Project was a great many anecdotal cases where children in one country's public library could interact with children in another country's library or school library and in so doing help to break down cross-cultural, cross-ethnic, cross-racial, and cross-ethnic barriers.

That's why they're interested in it, for the substantive value of what lessons were learned. That's why an evaluatory component, or call it a different word, assessment, is so important, because it has to be removed from the context of being purely anecdotal into something that library officials and public administrators can read and understand and thereby motivate them to do that kind of thing.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Rosalie.

MS. VLACH: I just wanted to say that something that Bobby said reminded me that frequently the librarians who came to us said: This is something substantial that I can take to prove that this is worthwhile. And they were going to use the materials that we gave them to help them sell something that they really wanted to do.

The other thing that I think -- I realize most of you Commissioners are what we consider outside the Beltway and that's great. But one thing that I discovered coming from inside the Beltway, that when I get outside the Beltway saying it was started in Washington was quite significant and that gave it a little more clout for those librarians who wanted to do something.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: The word "White House" has an incredible resonance.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: Yes. Oh, it does.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: I have a couple of questions that we need to look at, and that is this was a White House Millennium Project that belonged to this administration. What happens with the next administration?

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: Well, we won't keep it --

MR. ROBERTS: What are they going to do? If it's a successful program, somebody's going to come along and say, we don't want to do this any more because it's successful?

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: I think that elements of success with this program -- one of the things I really am interested in is when things work in an incubator how can you leverage and expand them so they touch more people? That's really an important part, and I think the question is what are the right homes for a project like this and how can it grow and who will nurture it.

There's going to be a tremendous amount of wealth given away in the next five years. What's going to happen to that transfer of wealth? Could part of it go to fund sister library projects? So who will understand that and nurture that?

But I agree with you, Bobby. I think we can have a million and ten ideas here. It's really up to Bob to let us know.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: I'd like to ask you how much of your time is spent on Sister Libraries, how much of your time is spent on legislative matters?

MS. VLACH: Quite frankly, Beth had gotten the program going. Certain processes were already in place. So I have not really devoted a great deal of time because it's been running so smoothly. We have worked together, I would say, maybe a day in the three months that I've been here.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: One day?

MS. VLACH: I mean total. We have met over the phone, we have met individually.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: One day.

MS. VLACH: But my time in terms of what I have had to do has been a little -- a day, a day and a half. Beth has really been carrying the main load, and La Keshia sends the applications out.

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: Not counting being at the shows?

MS. VLACH: No, no, we won't count that, that's true.

MR. WILLARD: Well, that should be counted.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Beth is currently under contract with us to continue. From where I'm standing, sitting, right now what I would like to put on the table is two things. Because we have the USECA money, because we have the direction from the Department of State and they are looking at this as part of "cultural diplomacy," taking the place of the old USIA, and because we have been chastised slightly by the State Department for our lack of interaction with UNESCO, I would like to say that we will complete this round, we will then do the documentation, but at the same time, because of the interest and because I think it would behoove us to do this and we are using USECA money to do so, I think the booth with the success stories really has to go to IFLA.

COMMISSIONER GRIFFITHS: Martha, Martha, can I make a suggestion? In addition to collecting the success stories, it seems to me that the evaluation component should also include some understanding of what it takes to get this going and then to keep it going --

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Yes, yes.

COMMISSIONER GRIFFITHS: -- along with some brief analysis of potential homes. I mean, whether it should stay here, whether it should go to Sister Cities, whether it should go to IFLA, whether it should go to UNESCO, and what are the pros and cons.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: I would be happy with that. I would feel comfortable with that.

MR. WILLARD: Why should we spend one penny on IFLA? We're going to go over there and raise the hopes of libraries from other countries that they can enter into partnerships with us and we've got to turn them down? I would rather raise \$100,000 and get 10,000 sister libraries.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: If we go to IFLA and we raise a lot of expectation, then you have a hell of a lot of documentation that would help you raise the money.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: And tell the people this is how you do it. We ought to have a booklet on how to do this.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Yes.

Abe.

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: Not in spite of the fact that we don't have a quorum, but really because we don't have a quorum, I would make a motion, I would make a motion that we leave this decision up to our Director. He's heard all of these opinions and I don't have any lack of confidence in his ability to sort out what he's heard and decide.

I think he should make a decision about when the program ends and that he should report back to us.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: But I would back what you just said, exactly what you just said before.

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: What, don't waste time?

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: No, that it go on until May 1st, that we see what the response is, and that we publish something to say, this is how you do it.

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: I've gone beyond that. I'm saying I would leave it up to the Director, who has heard all of the opinions of the people who are here.

MR. WILLARD: I spoke at the American Association of Community Colleges yesterday. They said, why can't we participate?

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: I would propose that Bob meet with two of the people who were at the digital divide Commerce meeting who he thinks could embrace this idea to give you enough resources to both come up with the answers that Jose proposed, the strategy that Martha

proposed, and look and advise our subcommittee on how the elements of success could be leveraged into uniting the future in a more expanded way. So get additional support to do that and to look into that.

MR. WILLARD: Well, I already have the target for the support.

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: Fine.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: We know that, but the letter hasn't been written and the money hasn't come.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: But the letter can be written and the money can come.

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: I actually, for some reason, I don't even know why, but I have a feeling that the Girl Geeks and the Emily's List could be really helpful here.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Emily's List is strictly political.

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: Oh, we can't touch that, okay.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Girl Geeks yes, Emily's List no.

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: Who'd have thought?

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: So we have a lot of things on the table. We have an Executive Director who will work with Bob, Rosalie, and Joan. But I still feel very strongly, because of our interaction with the State Department, that no matter what the final decision may be at the end of 2001, we need to be at IFLA this year.

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: Where is it?

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Where is it? Jerusalem.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: Jerusalem.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: I just think it's important, if only for the visibility and to show them what we've done and what can be done, because, whatever happens to this project, we have put in place a process and ideas that other entities on their own individually can carry out.

MR. WILLARD: I'll bet you we can talk the American Library Association and the Library of Congress into just putting our display in their booth. Why would we spend the money to travel if we're not going to be talking to people and recruiting?

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Because you need someone who can explain how it was done.

MR. WILLARD: That's what the report does.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: Well, we won't have the report by that time.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: We still need that human interaction. Remember what Gary Strong said last night, and it was reiterated by all the other winners, that the basic component of service is the human interaction. So that you have someone in Beth who has worked with the individual libraries and can explain the process, you know, the pros and the cons of how you go about developing it.

So I still think it's important, if only for visibility and if only to make the State Department happy.

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: It seems to me what projects need are ownership and evangelists and resources -- leadership, vision leadership, ownership, evangelists, resources. So if we think this project is worthy, then we have to identify who is the appropriate evangelist, leader, owner that can ensure it gets the resources to continue or morph into something else.

It's not clear to me in this project who that owner-leader is.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: It was Joan.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: It was Joan at the beginning, yes.

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: Well, I think she's a brilliant leader.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: I thought it up. I'm less than brilliant. I raised \$10,000. I went to other places and Bob said he was going to Bell and Howell. I'm careful, I'm a very careful person. I think I'm probably more careful than you people think I am.

(Laughter.)

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: But also let me just suggest to my colleague that the care that you took to make sure it succeeded --

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: No, that was Beth. There she is. Beth did it.

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: The care that the team, the care that the team took to the conceptualization, the implementation, the success, is an important achievement of the Commission. That idea, well designed at an early stage, could be appropriately grown to touch a million lives.

So my sense of this is to look at what is the next stage of growth. It's much like -- ideas are much like children in that they have early stages and then they go to the next stage. I think we need to say what's the right team and who's the right leader-owner for the next stage of this idea, and just realize it's morphed out of the infant stage to the next stage.

MR. HORTON: Isn't the international, the world stage, one way to do that?

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: Sure, absolutely.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Yes, Jack, and then we're going to end the conversation.

COMMISSIONER HIGHTOWER: I'd like to call the question on the motion.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: We can't. We can't have a motion.

COMMISSIONER HIGHTOWER: We can't have a motion?

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: But you can second it.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: I think that we will come to closure on this. There are a lot of ideas on the table and Mr. Willard and I will take them all under consideration and come up with a decision.

LIBRARY STATISTICS PROGRAM

Denise, how much time do you need?

MS. DAVIS: I can do it in five minutes if I don't get any questions.

(Laughter.)

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: And if you get questions?

MS. DAVIS: I'll respond to them as quickly as I can.

In your packet on the right-hand side towards the back, after the Library of Congress very thick stapled thing is a white sheet that says "NCLIS Library Statistics Program," and then two amber-colored sheets like this (indicating). Very good.

Just briefly, the key projects that I want to bring to your attention, and one actually didn't make it to this list because Rosalie and I met just the other day and decided that we were going to try and get something done in April. The first is the Internet study which has been talked about intermittently throughout the day and a little bit yesterday. That's right on track. We had a focus group session with public library people and some consortia people at PLA and also with the vendors who are going to be supplying some pieces of use measures, which is the significant change in the study this year.

Traditionally, the Commission has measured connectivity to the Internet and for the first time we're going to be asking questions about how do you use what you're connected to. We are

asking a few questions about the speed at which you connect and the number of work stations you have, and we have actually put a question in there that says you can check off "99 or more terminals," because we know a number of libraries that are going to be sampled in this survey will be responding 99 or higher.

The other piece of it is a boxed series of questions that are going to be looking at, do you have access to certain kinds of things, do you provide access, public access to certain kinds of things on these work stations? No work stations, some work stations, all work stations. That's a slight shift from the prior year study.

The other thing we're going to be doing, which is a second phase of the study and it's not part of the questionnaire, is selected focus groups with large public libraries, medium sized public libraries, small public libraries, rural, urban, and consortia, consortia in multi-type, where different kinds of libraries come together to participate as a consortia, public library only consortia, and some other groups, and asking them questions about how they're using it. What are they doing with the technology that they have?

So what we'll come away with is not only the data about how well are you connected, how many widgets do you have and so on, and where your funding -- how you're using the funding that you have to support these efforts, but also have some anecdotal data, information that we can put together in a summary report.

It's not clear now, we didn't have sufficient funds in this fiscal year to fully fund a report as we've seen in the past. But in August the deliverables are the data set and an executive summary from the two researchers. So from that the Commission will make a decision about how we're going to disseminate the information.

So that's part one. Any questions?

(No response.)

Seeing no questions, I'll move on to part two. Betsy Sywetz, who I wish had stayed, about six or eight weeks ago, I guess it's been now, got wind of some work that was being done at the U.S. Department of Education's Community Technology Access Points Initiative. There's a press release associated with this as well. I'm sorry, there was also a press release for the Internet study, which many of you have already gotten.

In talking to Betsy Sywetz at IMLS and also her having had discussions with the ALA Washington office, it was decided that we really needed to make the U.S. Department of Education absolutely aware of the fact that libraries are community technology access points, because they were not aware of it.

This man Norris Dickerd was clueless. He was, he was stunned. He had no idea that public libraries were playing this role.

So several conversations later, Betsy managed to get me and the ALA Washington office sort of on board with at least talking about this. What I decided to do, since I have all this data that comes out from these studies that are supported by the National Center for Education Statistics, was to go in and start looking at what bits of information we collect annually about public libraries and state library agencies that would fit into this database that this man wants to build about community technology access points.

From that discussion with Betsy Sywetz, we decided that what the Commission really needed was a task group to sit down and evaluate this, make a determination about what we were going to contribute, and then move forward from that point.

This is all part of the New Market Initiative that the President is doing. Fortunately on the timing, we were able to get all three groups -- ALA, IMLS, and NCLIS -- associated with this initiative through Norris Dickerd. So through publicity that he's done as well as our press release, there's this interconnectedness and the information is out there.

The group meets on Thursday afternoon, this task group, and the names are included here. But Rebecca Bingham will participate, Martha Gould, and we have a state librarian from Maryland, Maurice Travillian, who's going to participate, as well as the representative from ALA, IMLS, and myself.

From this we'll just brainstorm and decide what beyond the contribution from these data sets is it appropriate for the Commission to participate in, and also from this what's the role that IMLS and ALA will play into the future, if any. We really don't know at this point what's going to come of it, but at least we're talking.

Norris Dickerd will also be there to participate in the conversation and get a better understanding. So I see this as a great opportunity for us to market public libraries to this gentleman and that's how I'm intending to use the meeting as much as anything else.

That's happening on Thursday and I'll report back over e-mail to the group about what the results of that are.

Are there any questions?

(No response.)

Hearing none -- one thing which is not on the white sheet, but which I want to draw your attention to, back this summer, the summer meeting in ALA, and I think possibly even the fall meeting that we had here, I talked about a pocket guide the libraries statistics. I'll be working with Rosalie. We decided that it really just needs to be a one-pager thing and she and I are going to work on that this month, April, and put together some galleys on that and just get the thing out.

It won't be as elaborate as I originally had anticipated, largely because there's not a lot of money for it, but we are going to get something out. So as that progresses I will keep you posted.

Two other things that I want to draw your attention to which I think are significant, and this has more to deal with the library statistics program as it's managed through the National Center for Education Statistics, and that is their strategic initiative to move everything to the web.

It isn't that they aren't going to publish these educational tabulation reports in paper, but what they're doing is moving the data collection to the web and the editing and adjudication of the data online, so that they can move very rapidly in putting that information out over the Internet.

They will then take their normal publishing cycle to get the printed reports out, but what the effort is is to turn the data around in a very timely way. The hope is that by -- and we don't have any state librarians here, but the state library agencies survey that's done annually has traditionally had stragglers that a year would go by and they hadn't submitted their data yet. The District of Columbia was one of the places that did not submit their data.

We had a drop-dead deadline and we were able to do that because the data collection was done on the web. We simply took the web page down. They could not submit data after a certain date because there was no place to put it. It was extremely effective.

We spent a lot of time drafting very politically correct letters that went to state librarians, used the chiefs of state library agencies listserv through Barrett Wilkins, who's the research and statistics representative to the Federal-State Cooperative Survey and the state library agencies survey, used him as the conduit to keep the pressure on the state librarians.

They all met the deadline. Every single state for the first time ever reported on time.

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: And how did that happen?

MS. DAVIS: We told them that we were taking the web site down and they could not submit after a certain date. We also told them that we would impute their data and that they would not appear in the report, so that the per- data element would not show up for their state but we would impute for a national total.

I think politically none of them wanted big fat zeros in the data file.

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: There was a lockout date.

MS. DAVIS: Yes, but there was also the fact that if they didn't submit they would not have data reflected in that particular fiscal year's report, and I think politically that had more pressure than the deadline, although the technology allowed us -- this is a good thing -- it allowed us to strip away the web site.

Anyway, everyone met the deadline and the data's been edited and there was no imputation necessary because they all reported on time. So we have nice clean data and it'll get turned around in about six weeks.

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: Did the IRS hire you?

(Laughter.)

MS. DAVIS: No.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: No, but the Census; has the Census asked you?

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: No, no. But they're the ones who manage the data collection. Yes, they're the ones who manage the data collection. And what's interesting is they were the ones who were the most reluctant to bring the web site down. They kept saying: Well, give them a few more days, give them a few more days.

We said: No, they've had five months.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Bob.

MR. WILLARD: I would just like to go on record that I would encourage the Commissioners to stop suggesting alternative careers for Denise. I want her to stay here.

(Laughter.)

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: We need a ball and chain.

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: Congratula- tions.

MS. DAVIS: Thanks. I'm hoping that we can implement this same model. I think public library administrators, Bobby, are going to get hit with the same big heavy -- you're not at fault, but we have states like California that, if California doesn't report, we have a thousand public libraries that have not reported their data because the state library happened to be slow in turning it around.

And you have people like Bobby who have spent a lot of time getting their reports in on time and then to find out that the state librarian and his staff didn't turn it around to the feds is pretty outrageous. That message is getting out more and more, so there's a big of a squeeze at the state library level.

Those are the two significant things. What it means, though, from a bandwidth perspective is now you won't automatically be mailed the print reports from NCES. So you have to be told that the data is on the web. And now we have another issue of training library staff in how to actually use the data that's there, and the whole notion of having the reports up in a portable document format and how is that arranged so that you can only capture sections of it in print rather than printing out these reports that are oftentimes twice this density.

So there are some other issues that they are dealing with, but they're anticipating, the National Center for Education Statistics is anticipating, going back historically and putting every report

they've ever done up on the web. They've given themselves about a year to do this, and they moved two weeks ago from one building to another. So we'll see if they actually pull it off.

Those are my reports. If you have any questions please e-mail me. I am happy to respond.

COMMISSIONER HIGHTOWER: Thank you very much.

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: I attended the six days of statistics-related concerns at San Antonio starting with the state library agencies survey committee, and then I actually went through the new state data coordinators training. I was caught actually checking my e-mail at one point.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Yes, you were.

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: But I did learn a lot. Then I stayed for the steering committee meeting of the public libraries survey, and I actually went back to my library and trained my librarian and my reference librarian to use the peer library comparison tool right off the web. They were more amazed that I could teach them how to do it than they were at the facts of the comparison.

But they have really come a long way and the new -- I got the impression from other people that were there that the new data, state data coordinators, got a real head start over people who had come into the positions in the past.

MS. DAVIS: But the whole collection process is much easier. What Abe was talking about is a peer comparison tool where the National Center for Education Statistics has eked out during the fiscal year very critical data: per capita, population, number of service points, region, population served.

They allow libraries to go in and do comparisons. They can choose the library they want to compare themselves against based on a number of criteria. So you can look at per capita circulation, you can look at population served, anything that you want, and do some comparisons and figure out where you are, not only with the library or libraries that you want to compare yourself with, but also how do you rank within your own state and also how do you rank against the national average.

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: Then right on the web it will generate pie charts, bar graphs, color, everything.

MS. DAVIS: This is free. Not free; the federal government pays for it. But there is no charge.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: Is it true that less and less people are going to public libraries?

MS. DAVIS: This is one of those, things happen on the East Coast before they happen west of the Rockies. There is a trend on the Eastern Seaboard that may indicate -- we won't know until this next year's data collection is done, fiscal year '99.

Fiscal year '98 did not demonstrate nationally that there was a reduction in circulation or even library visits. However, both circulation and library visits are very soft numbers anyway to collect on. We'll have a better sense of that in fiscal '99 data, which is going to be collected in a couple of months. They're going to start the collection on that.

Once we look at that data we'll have a much stronger perspective on it.

The other piece that feeds into that is the fiscal year '98 and the fiscal year '99 data also has some Internet usage counts that come up in national collections, as well as some training questions. So there are other pieces that we need to look at to see if this is really an impact.

One thing that Jose-Marie commented about before earlier in sort of an off conversation was libraries aren't spending as much on collections because the budgets for the most part are not growing, so they have static dollars and the cost of materials is much higher. They are also displacing funding that they would have used for print resources to electronic, which costs considerably more.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: So.

MS. DAVIS: So somebody really needs to go in and analyze that. There have been state by state studies that have been done that show that there is no causal relationship between the Internet and reduction in library use and in fact circulation and in-library use is rising.

However, those are communities in Colorado and California and places like that. The East Coast, however, is seeing a modest decline. And we're hearing that from states who have current data that they're using.

So we'll have to see. There are too many factors involved in this. There are other things that are going on and the notion of collecting of collecting virtual visits is something that we really are trying to grapple with, because it isn't that the library resources aren't being used. People are coming to them in different ways and we need to get a handle on that, and we're trying to do that.

That's part of what the Internet study is going to do. We're introducing some of those questions that we were hoping would have gotten on the national surveys that didn't because the states simply were not ready to collect that kind of information yet. They were not prepared to collect.

So the Commission is spending the money to add some of those questions and get some of that so we can push the agenda a bit more.

COMMISSIONER GRIFFITHS: Denise, do you think that one of the reasons you might be seeing potentially the use of libraries going down is because people are using community technology centers instead? Is there any way? Is somebody collecting statistics on CTC's?

MS. DAVIS: No, but that's a good point and I'll bring that up at our meeting on Thursday. I'm not sure what's going to come of that project, but this may be an opportunity to figure that out.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: And also, libraries themselves are community technology centers.

MS. DAVIS: Absolutely. That's the big disconnect on some of this. I mentioned in our discussion about the digital divide that a number of public libraries in America are Internet service providers for their communities. They are the point of contact. They are the presence on the Internet for that community.

Bringing that to the forefront is really an important message to get out.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Yes, Abe.

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: As a person who goes around one part of my state testifying at library budget hearings in front of county commissioners and city councils, it's going to become more and more important to have Internet- related in-library usage figures that relate to value to the taxpayers.

The figures that aren't real helpful is how many butts sat in the seat, how long the average person sat there, how many pages they looked at. It's going to be necessary to be able to say what percent of what part of the usage was e-mail, which is a valid use, and what part otherwise would have been somebody standing at the reference desk.

In the same sense that I've always felt that they should count books left on table at the end of the day, and some libraries do, I think we've got to come up with some kind of an equivalent measure for stuff people looked at and then decided they didn't need to print out.

So we've got to get a lot more sophisticated in talking to funders about the value, some of it displacing earlier services, of the library services provided through the Internet.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: I think that's what Denise referred to when we talked about virtual hits, because it's one thing to go to a library web page, but then to be able to know not what they did afterwards, but how many different times they tried to find information. It's just looking at the services we provide in a very different manner, and I really think that you need to be complimented on beginning to come to grips with a very important issue.

MS. DAVIS: We have library systems like Houston Public that have a lot of technology support right in their facility and they can just pick up the phone and say: You know, we want to collect this; now could you figure out, write a script and make it do that, and they do and they're able to capture that information.

But being able to replicate that at little or no cost in every library in America is a very different issue. I mean, there are a lot of things that go into this. How are libraries connecting to the resources that they have? Do they have control over that? And by that I mean can they actually measure the usage?

A lot of libraries don't. The Internet service provider, he manages it out of his garage in the Ozarks and it's not a big system. They don't have the software available to them. They're simply providing the connection. They are not there to provide usage data. So they're relying on commercial services to do that and the extent to which they're able to.

There are leverage points by collecting the data and proving that we're not getting high enough quality data to explain the picture that we know is happening. We have the anecdotal, but we don't have the facts behind it. I think it will drive a lot of this.

I can't help but think there's a technology solution around the corner that's really pretty straightforward and very inexpensive. But we haven't gotten to the right people yet to make it happen. That's what all this data collection is about.

What's interesting, though, and I'll say this and then leave, in September of this year some very interesting studies were all completed about the same time. We have Joey Roger's Urban Libraries study that's being done, and that's a telephone survey that's asking people, do you use the Internet and how do you use it, and do you go through your library to get there, and when you get on the Internet do you go to your library?

So very specific questions asked differently to get at are people using the Internet to get to their libraries or are they using the library to get to the Internet. This is a household study that DeLea is doing and that will all come out some time through the summer and into the fall.

Our study will be done in August. We'll have something to release in September. ALA's Washington office, OITP is still working on this e-rate universal service thing, and hopefully that'll move forward and we'll get some data out of that. There are a number of studies that are going on right now.

When all of this comes together we'll have a very useful bucket of information to look at and start painting a picture. But it's taken us a long time to get to this place.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Great. Denise, thank you.

MS. DAVIS: You're welcome.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: We are going to take a ten-minute break.

(Recess.)

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: The next issue, Bob and Denise on digital archiving.

DIGITAL ARCHIVING

MR. WILLARD: I said a little bit about it this morning. Denise has done a writeup and I think to save time on this meeting we'll just put that into a publishable report and ship it around as an I.D.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Okay, because we did have a quickie meeting. Jose and I were there, okay. So if we get that out as an information document to everybody on the Commission, okay.

WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON LIBRARY

AND INFORMATION SERVICES 2000

Mr. Willard, the White House Conference on Library and Information Services 2000, also known as the National Forum or whatever.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: And God bless you.

MR. WILLARD: Where we are with that is nowhere. The President has received the request, one of Jeanne's last communications, responded. We got a letter from the President saying, interested, I've assigned it to a staff person. The staff person I think is overloaded with responsibilities.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: We should say who it is.

MR. WILLARD: It's Ellen Lovell.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: Ellen Lovell.

MR. WILLARD: White House Millennium Council Director.

I guess you had, Joan had some conversation --

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: We wrote her a letter and said this is what, that we had spoken to the President. The answer came back: No. So then I wrote a letter, you remember, saying that we were thinking of holding it somewhere else, but if they thought we were going to hold it in the White House that wasn't our idea, blah, blah, blah. And we never heard a word from her.

I called up her assistant and she said she got the letter. Now, you know, I've had three pushoffs and three strikes and you're out. We're not going to get it.

Part of it is -- when was it, Bob, do you remember? There's a reason. Somebody has the time set aside? Oh, the White House Historical Society has taken December of the President's last term to have a truly high bash. When the letter comes to me I'm throwing it away because they're going to want money.

MS. DAVIS: The whole month?

MR. WILLARD: Well, I think it's a combination. It's the White House bicentennial.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: That's exactly it. It's the White House bicentennial, but they get first dibs.

MR. WILLARD: Christmas decorations on the White House start on about December 2nd or so.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: But I thought Bob's idea of holding it somewhere else was a great idea. And I thought to myself: Well, I'll see Ellen Lovell around town; I'll speak to her in person. I haven't seen her since. So much for my getting around.

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: She's avoiding you.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: So it's my understanding, then, that right now this is sort of in abeyance.

MR. WILLARD: Yes, I think so. I think hope springs eternal. I still believe -- I've been the articulator of this position ever since forever -- that the person who spoke at the first White House conference and now occupies the White House shouldn't leave it without talking about libraries at least once more, whether it's a full-blown White House conference or it's just a media event or whatever.

I'm going to continue to keep pressure on them to come up with something before he leaves.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: What do you mean, "keep pressure on"?

MR. WILLARD: Just that.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: But I mean, are we going to write a letter? Are we going to hope to speak?

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Who knows. Whatever.

COMMISSIONER HIGHTOWER: He's going to use his resources.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: What?

COMMISSIONER HIGHTOWER: He's going to use his resources.

MR. WILLARD: If I run into him at a movie or something like that.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: And also remember that ALA held that meeting two mid-winters ago when we came up with the whole concept of the National Forum. I'm not sure where that's

gone, but I suspect, like the phoenix, it will rise again from the ashes. So we can just wait and see.

MS. SHEKETOFF: It's not rising at this time.

MR. WILLARD: In all candor, the idea of a large, involved White House conference, that has grown out of a legislative process in the past, and both times it was Congress has passed a law and appropriated money to do it and just instructed the President. In fact, it happened during one presidency, the instructions happened during one presidency, and the execution happened during a different one.

So I'm not going to waste any money on that model or any more time. But there are people who might still want to do that, waiting until a new occupant is in the White House.

THE FUTURE OF THE NATIONAL

TECHNICAL INFORMATION SERVICE (NTIS)

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: The next one is future of NTIS, Mr. Willard and Mr. Horton.

MR. WILLARD: Well, let me just take a minute to do some introductory work, although Woody needs no introduction. I just want to say some commendatory words because I think clearly the issue of NTIS crystallized so many of the issues that are incumbent upon government information policy.

We were just -- we were very fortunate that it happened. If you were doing planning, you wouldn't plan for it. Although remember, I did have STI on the strategic plan.

I have said many times before, and give me any opportunity I will again, that Woody is a master of consensus, that he makes sure that all of the parties that are involved in an issue know what's going on. Nobody can complain about being surprised when Woody is managing a process. They may not all agree.

Even the artfully chosen term for the draft of this report, which was "Emerging Consensus," there were people who pushed back on that. But it was an emerging consensus. It just didn't quite reach it. There are a few people who have minority views on what we've done, but I don't want to get into the substance of that. I'll leave that for Woody.

But in terms of process, I think we have been well served by having Woody on the staff as a consultant. So I'll turn it over to you.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: I would like also to say that Woody and Sarah -- and Sarah is not here today, Sarah Kadec -- were an incredible dynamic duo when it came to this process, and

also to Judy, who worked with them in terms of the editing and the finalization of what I think is a very important document.

MR. WILLARD: It should be pointed out that Woody's written about 150 books so far, but I'm still trying to teach him a little bit about writing.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Woody, you're on.

MR. HORTON: Briefly, what we recommended in this report was that the solution proposed by the Department of Commerce, to transfer the functions and resources and collections of NTIS to the Library of Congress, was not a solution that corrected the problems which were alleged, which were twofold.

One is that NTIS is forced under the law to be self-sufficient, self-sustaining, by collecting fees for the reports that it disseminates; and secondly, that it's so-called business model does not take advantage of the Internet and the fact that people can download reports for free, and therefore why should they pay a bundle of money to get hard copies?

The Secretary of Commerce in effect said: We're going to give these problems to the Library of Congress because we can't solve them and we think the Library of Congress knows more about information than we do.

We said, on the other hand, that we thought that the solution to the problem was not to transfer NTIS programs to the Library of Congress, that that would just perpetuate the problem without solving it. Instead, we said to the President and the Congress: Please give us some time to study this matter more carefully, at least for the balance of this current fiscal year and preferably into next year, so that we can look at the problem of what to do about NTIS, not just in the narrower context of yet another government reorganization, but rather to solve the root problem, which is to modernize the business model of how NTIS operates in the Internet age; and secondly, please, Congress and Mr. President, get them out from under having to be self-sustaining when it comes to all of their functions, including the collection and organization and bibliographic control of their information, which we said was inherently a governmental function, just as Census and many other government agencies must collect information, organize it, apply bibliographical controls, and yet their funding comes from appropriated funds. In some cases there are revolving funds, but by and large they are appropriated funds.

So we published our report with this recommendation, as you know, a couple of weeks ago on March 16th. We sent copies to the President and to the House and Senate Science Committees, and also to a couple of other key Congressmen whom we knew had a deep interest in this, notably Congressman Tom Davis, who heads the D.C. Subcommittee and who is being driven by the employment issue at NTIS.

Just last Thursday, I think, Judy got a call from the Senate Science Committee staffer with whom we had been dealing. Judy, do you want to say anything about that call?

MS. RUSSELL: Just that they are interested in finding a mechanism to let us do what we propose, which is to study it further, and they'll work with us to try to sort out how to do that sort of legislation. They don't want something that requires them to pass legislation to enable this to happen.

MR. HORTON: I had hoped in the ten- minute break we just had to find an e-mail message in my office from that staffer. We sent him a draft of a letter that would kick off that study phase that we hope to do, but we haven't yet received a formal communication from him.

The other significant thing that I should mention is that the Department of Commerce requested \$4.5 million in a supplemental appropriation for this fiscal year to close down NTIS. At the last moment, we're told this same Congressman Davis took that money out of the House appropriation bill that was finally passed. It was not in there in the version that was passed.

We do not yet know what the Senate is going to do because they haven't yet taken it up, nor do we know what's going to happen in the conference committee. But I think at this point at least we can safely say the report is being widely read by all the stakeholder groups with which we dealt.

We're trying to stay in close contact with and stay in the good graces of both the Department of Commerce and the two committees on the Hill, as well as the Appropriations Committee. Our expectation is that, because of the removal of that 4.5 that's already happened, I interpret that as a good sign because technically legally that means that NTIS is still staying operating in the Department of Commerce.

The only other thing that I can think of that's significant is that Secretary Daley was never able to get Hill supporters. Not a single member of Congress has agreed to support the legislation that he proposed to close down NTIS. So he has no legislative backers for his proposal.

Of course, we don't -- we are not trying to take sides on this issue. We're trying to keep an open mind and study all the alternatives. There are at least even or eight other things that could be done.

One of them is to leave it in the Department of Commerce, just keep it where it is, but change the statute, change the business model, and change the policy so it would work.

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: So it's not self-funded.

MR. HORTON: That's right. But that self-funding only applies to 20 percent or one- fifth of the total budget. So we're not asking the Congress to give NTIS carte blanche. We're only asking for that 20 percent.

MR. WILLARD: In fact, quite the opposite, part of the recommendation is that severe restrictions be put on NTIS that will prevent them from getting into some of the entrepreneurial

activities that they've sought in the past, which they had to do in order to cover the costs of the public function.

MR. HORTON: We are trying to arrange a meeting with the Deputy Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Mallett, who appears to be the key player on the President's side. We've also asked to see Congressman Davis. Senator Frist, who heads the House Science Committee, is the key person on the Senate side, although Congresswoman Morella has held a hearing and she has an interest in the matter.

There are a few others, but basically Mr. Mallett and Senator Frist in the Senate and Congressman Davis seem to be driving this issue.

Questions?

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: I just think Congressman Nadler would be interested in the results, so feel free to contact him and mention it.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Abe.

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: Let me show you how little I know about the legislative process in Washington. I just heard you talk about they're asking for a supplemental appropriation to close it down, but which would allow them to keep it open. This wasn't something that was in our job of work when our budget year started in which we did this.

Are there some reasons that I'll understand immediately when they're explained to me why we shouldn't ask for a supplemental appropriation specifically for this. And I'll use round numbers that have no relationship to anything that I know. Let's say that if we looked at our staff time, this cost us \$35,000, I don't know, \$20,000. What if we said it just cost us \$20,000, we want a supplemental appropriation for \$15,000?

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Bob.

MR. WILLARD: I would much rather -- what we did is we deferred action in the GPO area, which is where we did have some money earmarked. I would, rather than trying to tin- cup for a relatively modest amount of money, I'd rather use it as an example when we go talking to the Congress about in general how we stand ready to do this sort of activity when they come up and we ought to be funded at a higher level, use that as a general justification for increasing our appropriation.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Judy.

MS. RUSSELL: I want to just quote one thing that I didn't say about what Floyd said when he called, Floyd the staffer that we've been dealing with. He said: It seems to me that this is exactly the kind of thing that your Commission is uniquely able to do. He looked at what we had accomplished, he had looked at what we had explained about our mission, and he said: Wow, you're a resource and we want to continue using that resource.

So I think Bob's right. I think we've gained far more than we've spent, because we've begun to get people on the Hill to recognize that they can turn to the Commission with a problem and that we can solve it or help them solve it.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Question, Mary?

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: Let me just suggest that one thing for you to consider would be that institutions become vulnerable in times of change and there's been a masterful continuity of the leadership from Jeanne to Martha and Bob, and I'm really grateful to see that. I think the Commission has wonderful momentum now and there have been some wonderful ideas described here -- the sisters project, the research, the team efforts that you have.

It seems to me you might be able to educate people about, here's additional things that we could because the momentum of the digital economy and the digital society is moving so fast that to go and wait another year to say, here's our budget, you're not being responsive enough to the pressures of the time.

If we did this in the Internet economy, the sailboats would be flat. We have to go raise money every six months or every four months because now you're opening in Asia, you know; well, it's \$22 million for Asia or \$25 million for Europe. So people think about it like a sailboat. Where's a sailboat going? The winds are changing, adjust the sails. Not it comes up for budget.

So you may not want to do that, but I'm just saying in part of this culture of operating in more responsiveness, the notion of submitting a budget once a year and getting it approved may not necessarily accomplish all the things that could be done to be responsive to the citizens' point of view about the vast issues that are happening here.

So if there was reason to kind of take a look at the distillation of these ideas and say, here are three ideas that matter, here are three Commissioners that can go educate why a supplementary authorization would be a good idea, I would be in favor of that. I think that's a good point.

Abe, I think that's what you were saying.

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: I'm not sure I'm in favor of it, but I was willing to display my ignorance. I didn't understand what was obvious when Bob mentioned it and that is that we did defer some work on the GPO study. I still personally feel that the GPO study may result in the most new good things for the citizenry that we may be involved in while I'm alive. So I hope we really did just mean defer, yes. And this has actually helped that effort.

But query: Have we ever asked for a supplementary or would we ever?

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Well, there is a whole bunch of process and I think I would suggest before we verbalize this to death is that you go back and look at our budget information and you look at the cover letter, because the way we worked it last year -- and you remember we ended up with a 30 percent increase. We actually have a 15 percent increase over last year in this year's

budget, and we had I think a very interesting conversation with Mr. Porter, Bob and I. He gave us an enormous amount of time considering how busy he was that day.

Oh, it was Judy and I. You were someplace else. I can't keep track. It was Judy in I who met with him.

I have some meetings scheduled on the Hill with Obey's staff and Goodling. So we are working on this. But remember, you still have to jump through the hoops at the federal level with a very arcane budget process that we have to live with.

MS. RUSSELL: NTIS was not technically asking for additional money. They were asking to be allowed to move money from one of their sub-agencies to NTIS, so we weren't netting an increase in the overall presidential budget, which is a very different process to go through from OMB to say, here, we want whole new money. They're moving it from one pot to another, they're moving it from NIST.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Whereas we've actually gotten twice now considerable increases.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: Mary, I think you would have been very proud of us. Woody and Bob called in the OMB budget investigator or whatever and I came in and they were teaching him about the NCLIS and our budget.

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: Well, let me just say I am really proud of you and I have really a lot of confidence in you. That's why I think the only thing I disagree with is that the assumption is it's an arcane process we have to live with.

I think that china -- and I've told chairmen this. I said the china that needs to be broken up there is that it's not just this group that may need to be more agile; Congress needs to be more agile, because this is not the only program that maybe they need to tweak the sails on and increase the budget, or at least be more flexible.

So budget is much more your area than my area, but my sense is Blumberg got it right. He had the institution he was running and then he put a little nimble institution across the street and said: Compete with the institution I'm running.

So I think the question is how does the Congress become nimble around the budget process when there are changes that are happening? But I tend to be a little out there because I'm from California and that's the way we think. But you know what, they think like that in New York now. In New York they're thinking agilely, too. So you've got bicoastal agility happening, and people come to Washington and they start yawning, they do. And it's not what it used to be.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: Yes, but this is where the money comes from. They may yawn, but this is where the money comes from.

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: But the money needs to maybe be -- they may need to be more responsive. What I love about the way you all work is you're such wonderful teachers. So you teach them here and then they learn it somewhere else.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Well, put it this way. It is an arcane process that is in place now that we have to live with. Therefore, if you come against a barrier you have two solutions. You either leap over it or you go around it. Right now I think for the past two years we've managed to leap over it, and hopefully we will pull off the same thing this year.

But eventually, yes, the inertia of the process of what goes on on the Hill is a little bit like an ant pushing a boulder up a hill. Eventually it will change and I think what will drive the change is not so much what we do here in this room, but the technology. As you said, we are moving in Internet time, and eventually Congress will wake up to that.

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: I imagine they'll be appropriating tax moneys as it's collected within ten years.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: It's very possible. Who knows.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: So anyhow, where do we go from here?

COMMISSIONER HIGHTOWER: This is the first time we've had money in surplus for a long time, 37 years. I agree with Mary that things are changing, but I don't want to pay the price for \$15,000 or so. If we had been given a major thing to do that was going to be just terrible to do, then we ought to come and ask for a supplemental appropriation.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Absolutely, absolutely.

COMMISSIONER HIGHTOWER: But we were given a small thing to do, which we did, and we can do it and say we did a good job of it and we want you to know we're here, we want to do these things. I think you have made the best politics out of all of it.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: And if Congress come back and says to us, we want you to do X, Y, Z, then we say: Fine, fund it.

COMMISSIONER HIGHTOWER: Sure.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Which is exactly what happened with the GPO study.

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: Well, you're probably brighter and more politic than I am, so I would defer to the thought. But I would like it that they would come back and say: Gee, we'd like you to do your thirty-first annual conference and symposium, we'd like you to double this. So I like the notion of them coming to us and saying: Woe is us that we did not give you enough when you have such a big mandate.

I think you're right, education is probably best. It works usually with men, I think.

(Laughter.)

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: What did she say?

MS. RUSSELL: She said it works easier with men, and there are a lot of them up there on the Hill.

COMMISSIONER HIGHTOWER: Men are more educable because they've had more women teachers.

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: Well, we'll remember that, and Emily's List will, too.

PUBLICATION, HEARING ON

"KIDS AND THE INTERNET"

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: The last issue on the committee and projects update, we have the publication and hearing on the "Kids and the Internet." Judy, do you want to talk about how we're going to disseminate?

MR. WILLARD: Yes. There's not a huge amount to say except that, in spite of the fact that the hearing was a long time ago, that because of our limited staff resources it took a very long time to get it done. Barbara did a lot of work on pulling together the draft and getting all the documents together.

I really commend it to at least a heavy scanning, if not a reading. It stands up incredibly well, because I had to reread it in doing the final proofing and it has not aged out, surprisingly enough. It's as timely today.

There is many, many things in the appendices that were submitted for the record that you did not see or hear in the course of the hearings. So it's very well worth going through it.

We do have the intention to be sure that it reaches every member of Congress and printed a sufficient quantity to be sure of that, because I think the issue is so timely. I think a lot of the suggestions that came up this morning are very good ones in terms of trying to reach some other constituencies with it, and we can certainly look at all of that.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Are you going to send one to Doctor Laura?

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: Oh, I hadn't thought of that. Oh, that's too good. Over your letter, over a letter from you.

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: Absolutely, absolutely.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: Absolutely. There we go.

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: Put that in the communication plan.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: Absolutely.

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: And the Girl Geeks.

MS. RUSSELL: Any suggestions you have of other people who might not normally see Commission publications who should see it?

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: Dr. Joy Brown. She's number four in the country on the radio. I think that Katy Couric is really important and the Today Show.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: Diane Rehm.

MS. RUSSELL: Wouldn't that be great, to get Martha on Diane Rehm to talk about this?

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: Oprah, I think Oprah.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: Will somebody take that down? I'll send a letter to Diane Rehm?

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: The ALA Intellectual Freedom Committee?

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: I don't know that I would go that far.

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: I will send a letter to CBS' early morning show.

MS. SHEKETOFF: We'll be happy to give you the list of who is on the committee.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Thank you. I was just going to ask Emily if you would give us names and suggestion of people within the American Library Association that we definitely should send to.

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: I think a personal lunch with everybody on the Appropriations Committee would be good for you, I really do. I mean, we're talking about change. Let's educate them one at a time, and maybe you and Bob or you and somebody. Each of the Appropriations Committee members should have this.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: How about the new head of PBS?

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: Perfect.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: Pat Mitchell.

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: I think whoever knows that person.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: I do.

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: Okay.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: And also, I've met the head of NPR.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: That's what I'm talking about.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: No, you said PBS.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: Oh, PBS, excuse me.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: I think National Public Radio should get that.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: Who's that?

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: Moira Gunn on National Public Radio reaches 140 people through her Technation show.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: Who does?

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: Moira Gunn. I will make sure you're there. And we just had Fred Fiskin from CBS Radio, so we can get you on CBS Radio. Radio's really big on this topic.

COMMISSIONER GRIFFITHS: I can get you on ABC News if you're interested.

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: That would be great, ABC News. I think the media is really important. And USA Today. Does anybody know anybody at the major newspapers?

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: I don't know. USA Today is not in my cubbyhole. That's not my cubbyhole.

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: That's okay. Your newspaper did a story on me and it got to more people than anybody I know of.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: We discourage people on the board from using the newspapers for their own personal use, no matter if it's --

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: You have to do that.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: I can call Dave Letko at Gannett and find out from him suggested people that we can all on the major Gannett papers.

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: I can't remember who the Commissioner was who was most -

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Walter Anderson.

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: Walter on Oprah with some of the kids would be great.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: Oprah, I hadn't thought of that.

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: Walter with Oprah and the kids.

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: Maybe if it were selected as a book of the month.

(Laughter.)

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: Absolutely, that's a good idea.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Don't everybody talk at one time.

I think that we have some very good ideas on the dissemination. Anything else you can think of, make sure you e-mail it to Judy and Rosalie and whatever, and that's it.

Okay, any other comments? Please read this. I think it's an extraordinary document, and the thing that I find so fascinating is in this next Congress once again filtering is going to rise up out of the ashes burning brightly.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: Denise would like to talk.

MS. DAVIS: I just have a question. How many copies do we have?

MS. RUSSELL: We printed 2,000 copies and we'll use, obviously, 500 or so just to get to the Hill.

MS. DAVIS: I'd like some for Thursday for my meeting. I want Norris Dickerd to walk away with one of these.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: So that when we look at whatever legislation is going to crawl out from under whatever, then we can get this to the people in Congress that are dealing with it and say, before you do anything you best read this, because what is in there is timely.

COMMISSIONER GRIFFITHS: I assume you're going to get it to the candidates?

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Oh, yes.

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: We probably should have one of our little brochures in there.

MS. RUSSELL: The entire brochure is reproduced --

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: How about sending one to the Hill Rag? How about sending one up to the Hill Rag.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Do not everybody talk at once. The Hill Rag.

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: Roll Call.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Roll Call.

Jack, you had your hand up?

COMMISSIONER HIGHTOWER: Well, somebody said send it to all the candidates. No point in doing that.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: No, just to the policy gurus for the two presidential candidates.

COMMISSIONER HIGHTOWER: I think, though, that we need to reserve back enough because we don't plan to print it again. We can get some pretty good estimates about how many new members of Congress are going to be elected. We'll miss it by four or five maybe in each house. If we miss it by four or five in each house, gosh, they can make the estimates closer than that. So I think we need to hold back some copies.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: How much did it cost, 2,000 copies? What was the cost?

MS. RUSSELL: Right about \$5,000.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: What we're talking about is getting it into the hands of only the policy gurus for the two presidential candidates.

COMMISSIONER HIGHTOWER: Oh, I thought you were talking about candidates for Congress.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: No, no.

COMMISSIONER HIGHTOWER: Oh, presidential candidates, sure.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Yes, Mary.

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: Is a digital copy posted on the web site?

MS. RUSSELL: Absolutely.

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: So it seems to me the question is who needs a print copy and who needs to just be able to go print a copy. So that's how you have to kind of carefully craft it.

MS. RUSSELL: But this is an example, and this goes back to our NTIS study, this is an example of the kind of report that how many people are going to sit down and print out 282 pages? Some people will, but a lot more people won't. Where if one is there --

MR. WILLARD: Yes. We also are going to break it up so that people can print parts of it. We haven't done that yet.

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: Especially since it's posted as a PDF, so a lot of people will print it that way.

MS. RUSSELL: Yes, it's posted as a PDF.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: I think that we have a lot on the table. We're going to have very good distribution of this.

I'd like to go on to the last. Beth has already made her report on the Sister Cities Project, so I would then invite the two liaisons who are here, Emily and then Payton, to please give us any input and comments. Come to the table or pick up the remote cordless wonder.

MS. SHEKETOFF: Okay, how's this?

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Great.

COMMISSIONER HIGHTOWER: Why don't you have a seat over there so we can all see you.

MS. SHEKETOFF: Because this is such a pretty face.

Well, I found the meeting again today very interesting. Thank you. We all have our assignments, but I think that we're facing some very big challenges in these next few months. The Congress is in a very contrary mood and until they leave town there is great potential for problems.

There is already one filtering, a bill on the appropriations bill for ESEA Title III, and that will not be the only filtering amendment. We have been able to garner some support for school libraries as people move forward in thinking about appropriations for this year, but there probably won't be any appropriations bill until what's called the end game.

So again, any influence this Commission can have on the President will be part of what will be the end game. That will be very helpful to raise his sensitivity to the library issues and to make sure that our issues are there at the end and that he and the people around him understand how dangerous a filtering amendment could be without serious thought behind it.

People seem to be rushing for some sort of quick solution which will turn out to be no solution at all. So that is something that the Commission can really be very helpful with. Because Congress is not going to be able to come to a conclusion, the leadership at the White House and in the Congress is going to probably end up making most of the decisions on appropriations this year on whatever is attached to the appropriations bill, which could be all sorts of trouble.

That's sort of where we are. I think that we're moving forward on other issues. There seems to be a lot of support for government access to information. Everybody's doing a very good job of sensitizing the --

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: You say "government access to information"?

MS. SHEKETOFF: I'm sorry. The people's access to government information. This has become a hot topic in town. A lot of people are talking about it and groups that have not been involved in this in the past are starting to see that it has an impact on them. So that you have consumer groups being very concerned about this, not just because of the environment but because of health care and other issues where access to this information will become very important.

The more people who study the issue and become involved, the better chance there is that the public will continue to have as much access as possible, no matter who's in the administration, what administration it is. So that's very important.

I wonder if you've got any questions for ALA, areas that we can be working with you to help you accomplish your mission?

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Yes, Denise.

MS. SHEKETOFF: Denise.

MS. DAVIS: I just have a question. I don't want to put you on the spot, but do you happen to know -- the one survey I forgot about when I was making my presentation was the study that's been outsourced.

MS. SHEKETOFF: To the University of Illinois.

MS. DAVIS: What's the release date on that?

MS. SHEKETOFF: They're hoping the study will be done in September, so that the release date would be soon after that. But I have not heard that they are on time on that, and I know that there was some discussion about ALA's OITP study and we do not have full funding for that yet. So we have decided to start with the funding that we have and we're still out trying to make up the rest of the funding so that it will be a complete study over a number of years. As each piece is done, we would release that information. And if we got more resources, we would be able to include more information in that study.

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: OITP?

MS. SHEKETOFF: Right.

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: Office of Information --

MS. SHEKETOFF: Oh, I'm sorry. Office of Information Technology Policy, and it's a study, not just on connectivity in school and public libraries, but on how that connectivity is being used, what technology is doing, what impact that it's having in communities, and who is using it, so that we would be better able to target resources in the future as to where more resources need to be and what they need to be able to do.

From what we hear, ESEA reauthorization is probably not going to pass this year. So it would come up again next year, and that would be the opportunity, if we have the data, to focus more resources on school libraries where we feel more resources are probably necessary, both in certain geographic and economic areas.

But we don't have the statistics to prove that at this point. We only have anecdotal evidence.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Bob.

MR. WILLARD: Does ESEA have a hard and fast drop-dead date when it has to be renewed by?

MS. SHEKETOFF: What we're being told is that there doesn't seem to -- they don't seem to be able to get any sort of agreement. So what will happen is that, as well as a number of other things, will just be put off for a year and then brought up again in the next Congress, when there would possibly be a different party in power or at the White House or something.

The other thing, the other area of study that we're looking at, is we're trying to work with the FCC to get access to the raw data that they get from the schools so that we can do a study of just what the FCC e-rate money is going for and what is happening and what impact it's having in those places.

We do know that the FCC is probably going to have a press event in the next few weeks to announce that in the third round the level of money available will be probably \$2.25 billion. They've had requests for over \$4 billion, so everybody who has applied will not get e-rate access and it won't be at the levels that they have requested.

That's all I know.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Are there any other questions for Emily?

(No response.)

We appreciate your being here and I would like to go on record as saying again that we did write -- I wrote a note to Bill and I think we sent a very formal letter thanking him for the support of the National Library Services Award event. But again I would like to express our appreciation -- and I'm sure IMLS feels the same -- for ALA's support of this award.

MS. SHEKETOFF: We were happy to do it, and that's just the sort of thing we feel it's very important -- I believe that it's very important for libraries to be successful. We must raise the visibility of library services to the public. The public does depend on libraries for a number of things which they don't realize, and there are services available that they don't know about.

So we need to do a much -- we in the library community need to do a much better job of communicating to the general public the things that we do, the way we can serve them, and the information that's available to them in the public libraries and the school libraries and the special libraries and the medical libraries and the law libraries, because it's all there and it's waiting for them. The more they understand what's available to them and the more they use these services, the better off the library community is going to be.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Thank you.

Payton.

MR. NEAL: On the issue only of the NTIS study, the Software and Information Industries Association I think is mobilized now to start thinking about the results. Through Bob and Woody's good offices, we are already projecting what a logical next step might be for the private sector.

Personally, Woody and I have been playing these information policy games in this town for a lot of years, but this particular effort I think was really a revitalization of a lot of people who had been on the reservation before, but a lot of new faces at the table who learned a great deal in a short time from the efforts that the Commission, staff and consultants were able to put together.

We, like the Commission, are a little bit nervous of the silence that is sort of resounding now from all quarters in official Washington and I guess, without trying to quote former Congressman Hightower, I would probably make my own observation that it's sitting in the in boxes of a lot of important places and no one yet has gotten sort of a wakeup call to pick it up and look at it.

Our private sector, and I guess from my own perspective I will tell you, colleagues who are in the trade association I now belong to and those who no longer are in that particular association, but have long been my colleagues in the government information policy issue, need to be on the distribution list. I think Woody and I are putting together a list where those people can get a copy of the report, because whether it's good, bad or indifferent, in the private sector you may come together and meet, but you don't necessarily say what you're doing or who you're doing it with.

I guess the capitalist system and the private information economy must be good, and I think I've got a lot of colleagues in companies who are making their own way in this town in certainly two of the three branches of government, trying to see what this means.

Finally, I would say that it's likely that the private sector may mobilize more after the election and when we take what we hope will be GPO phase three and put it together with Title 44 reform and NTIS in a sort of broad, sweeping government information policy forum which will bring our people out and hopefully a lot of dollars which we hope will be put in a pot with our colleagues and our worthy adversaries with other points of view.

We spent a lot of time on the Title 44 revision for two years one Congress back and, contrary to what some have said, it kind of got torpedoed by a submarine beneath the sea that I think none of us were as aware of as we probably should have been.

So we've learned some valuable lessons about that and I think and I hope we'll come back again in 2001 and do a better job.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Thank you, Payton.

Well, we are actually ten minutes away from our set adjournment time. Are there any comments from the Commissioners?

(No response.)

MS. RUSSELL: Would you just call attention to that for anyone who is not on federal travel orders.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Oh. For anyone who is not on a federal travel order, the cost of the three breaks Monday and Tuesday and the continental breakfast and lunch on Tuesday will be \$18. The cost for the breaks and the continental breakfast only, no lunch, will be \$8 and the check is to be made out to Judith C. Russell.

As you know, we cannot spend federal dollars on food.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: Who has many plans or the money.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Right.

MS. RUSSELL: Most of you who are on official travel, your breakfast and lunch portion of your per diem will be taken to cover the meals and the breaks.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: So this just goes for people who are not on federal travel.

Tomorrow night there is the National Agricultural Library opening and reception. Who here is going to be attending?

(A show of hands.)

Rebecca, Joan, myself, Bob, Judy, my sister.

COMMISSIONER HIGHTOWER: I might, but I don't know. It's still up in the air.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Okay. Abe, you're heading out?

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: I'm going out at 4:00 o'clock tomorrow.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: So where do we meet?

MS. RUSSELL: Should we meet here at -- what, leave around 4:00?

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: By what transportation method?

MS. RUSSELL: I'll have my car.

MR. WILLARD: I'll have mine.

MS. RUSSELL: So I think between us there should be enough vehicles.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: So we'll meet in the Commission offices at 4:00 o'clock.

COMMISSIONER HIGHTOWER: But we're going to meet in the morning, though.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Tomorrow morning is the memorial service for Jeanne, 8:30 in the Wattell Pavilion, which is right next to the Coolidge Auditorium. There will be refreshments. The service will start at 9:30 in the Coolidge Auditorium. As you enter the Jefferson Building, you go down the left-hand corridor; is that correct?

MS. RUSSELL: Yes. The building opens at 8:30 and they will have extra people on so they can move a lot of people through quickly, because you do have to go through the traditional government building metal detector. But as you come through the metal detector you're in a corridor that runs the length of the building, and you just stay on that corridor and walk as though you were going to go toward the Supreme Court. There should be a whole flow of people going. It's on your right side.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Yes, Beth.

MS. BINGHAM: I just want to say that the Commission don't always necessarily hear about the good things that staff do. But Denise came to the Louisiana Library Association and as a member or Past President or whatever I was really proud that she had standing room and no place to sit. It was like at all the meetings with ALA. People were hungry for her message. The questions that were asked -- she was a participant in a panel discussion and the majority of the

questions that were asked, and the program went on forever after the ending time, were directed at Denise about the work that the office is doing.

So I think that you have a very wonderful ambassador.

(Applause.)

MS. DAVIS: And we were quoted in the local newspaper.

MR. WILLARD: And copies of that newspaper article will be shared with the Commissioners.

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: I just have a question for housekeeping. When we arrange meals like this, does the staff have any options or are they automatically included? I'm a little sensitive to that because, I mean, do they have the option of bringing their own lunch or not?

MS. RUSSELL: Several of the staff decided not to participate in the lunch.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Yes, they have an option.

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: Yes, I think we should be sensitive to that.

MS. RUSSELL: When we're out of town it usually isn't much of an option because we don't have that much time.

COMMISSIONER FURLONG: I have just one last idea. I think this is my last probably -- I don't know if this is my last meeting or maybe next to the last. I'm not sure. But I would like to see a hall of service in the Commission offices where all the executive directors could be listed and some notes about the kinds of things that were accomplished during their tenure. It seems to me as part of the thirtieth anniversary it would be nice to have a hall of service.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: I think that when we are in our new quarters, we talked about putting up the photographs of the former Chairs and certainly we can expand that and we should expand that, I agree. Thank you.

With that, we are adjourned.

VICE CHAIR CHALLINOR: Thank you, Martha.

(Applause and, at 4:23 p.m., the meeting was adjourned.)